Volume III Number 2

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1926

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

EDWARD B. POLLARD, *Managing Editor*
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, *Business Manager*

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. Conrad Henry Moehlman	131
THE GREAT COMMISSION. Frederick L. Anderson	170
EDUCATED YOUNG PEOPLE—THE PASTOR'S PROBLEM. William Coleman Bitting	184
A FIRST CENTURY SAINT IN THE EIGHTEENTH. Owen Philips Eaches	190
INVOLUTION A NEEDED WORD IN RELIGION. H. F. Huse	196
THE ATTITUDE OF JESUS TOWARD THE MOSAIC LAW AND THE EATING OF BLOOD. W. W. Keen	203
A FIFTEENTH CENTURY MARTYR. John Crosby	209
ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES	
Excavations Near Kirkuk. Edward Chiera	217
Quaint Mistranslations. E. B. Pollard	222
NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS	226
WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE	237
BOOK REVIEWS	239

Printed for CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY *By*

THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, $1.50, post free

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, April, 1926, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

Vol. III APRIL, 1926 No. 2

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM*

Professor CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN

Rochester Theological Seminary

THE theory and practise of Christian baptism have provoked interminable discussion, misunderstanding, schism, and persecution. Volumes would be required to relate that sad story. He who anticipates immediate unity in Christian attitude in regard to the hundred and one questions involved in baptism might well be assigned to the foot of the class.

Two of the mountains of difficulty are the approach to the Bible and the approach to Christian tradition. As long as the New Testament is assumed to be a law-book, a collection of statutes permanently to be enforced, a manual upon Christian theology, Christian organization, and Christian worship, it will be almost impossible to secure anything like unity in ecclesiology. After a long process of education, Christianity may some day come to appreciate the New Testament as a series of reminiscences of the teachings and deeds of Jesus, plus a selected list of letters of Paul and other early Christians, and notes upon a few phases of the early development of the Christian community. Until that happy day dawns, all the innu-

* Appearing also in *Rochester Theological Seminary Record.*

merable Christian units will continue to demonstrate their point of view and practise from the New Testament. Lacunæ will be filled in. Variations will be overlooked. Doubts will be resolved by dogmatic assertions. And conformity will be maintained.

Four phases of the Christian controversy regarding baptism are briefly reviewed in the following study: Extra-Christian practise of baptism; the New Testament and baptism; the principal Christian interpretations of baptism; some present aspects of the question.

I. Extra-Christian Practise of Baptism

Primitive peoples of the present epoch in history employ baptism at the time of the birth of a child. Both the mother and the child are affected by these rites.

Long before the Christian era, baptismal ceremonies were in vogue. The Teuton father as priest of the household sprinkled the newly born child and consecrated it to the gods protecting the home. At birth the ancient Greek child was bathed in water in connection with the use of oil and wine. The Romans passed their sons through water upon the ninth day and their daughters upon the eighth day, bestowing names upon them, anointing their foreheads and lips with saliva in order that they might be protected against the demons. Candidates for initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries were both bathed and given a new name. Demosthenes ridicules the process of initiation into the mysteries of Sabazios by means of baptism. The consecration into the fellowship of the Isis-Serapis mystery, in the course of which the old man died and a new man was born, began with baptism. The purification and regeneration of the individual were sometimes accomplished by a baptism in blood. The one undergoing this rite descended into a deep tomb covered with perforated boards upon which a bull was pierced through the breast with a holy spear. As the flow of the warm blood covered the candidate

with gore, it also purified him. On emerging from his bloody tomb, the baptized person was worshiped as one cleansed from all impurity.

This association of water with the washing away of defilement is not hard to explain. Water removes dirt. Water quenches thirst. Water causes things to grow and blossom. Water rescues the doomed dry grass from death. Water moves, flows, sustains life, is alive. Water is life-giving. Why should not the water of life cleanse from moral stain and confer new life?

The Mosaic law prescribed total immersion for a number of different situations varying from the cleansing of the leper to the purification of the holder of the goat destined for Azazel.[1] In preparation for the descent of Jehovah upon mount Sinai, the Hebrews washed their garments.[2] The Essenes baptized themselves very frequently. The Books of Adam and Eve represent Adam as immersed in Jordan for forty days and Eve as immersed in the Tigris River for thirty-seven days upon their expulsion from paradise.[3] The Sibylline Oracles exhort to the washing of "your whole bodies in ever-running rivers."[4] "Baptism next to circumcision and sacrifice was an absolutely necessary condition to be fulfilled by a proselyte to Judaism."[5] So usual was baptism for the Hebrews that Jewish scholarship affirms with reference to the baptism by John that

> the only conception of baptism at variance with Jewish ideas is employed in the declaration of John, that the one who would come after him would baptize not with water, but with the Holy Ghost.[6]

[1] Lev. 14 : 8, 9; 15 : 5-10, 16, 18, 19-27; 16 : 24, 26, 28; 17 : 15; 22 : 46.
[2] Exod. 19 : 10.
[3] Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, II, 135.
[4] Ibid II, 377ff.
[5] Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Baptism."
[6] More extended discussion of the Jewish attitude toward the practise of baptism will be found in Schuerer's "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ," Division II, 2, page 319ff.; *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1896; the article on "Baptism" in Hastings' Dictionary of Religion and Ethics; the Jewish Encyclopedia, I, 69f, II, 499ff., V, 224ff., X, 220f.; *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1911, p. 609f.; Wall, "History of Infant Baptism," I, pp. 1-28. The best brief discussion of baptism from the comparative point of view is found in the article on "Baptism" in Hastings' Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, upon which study the above narrative depends.

II. The New Testament and Baptism

1. *Variation in the primitive Christian practise of baptism* is hinted at in " the teaching of baptisms " of the sixth chapter of Hebrews.

The earliest reference to baptism in the New Testament has to do with the baptism with water administered by John the Baptist.[7] It was conferred upon members of the Jewish community. It was accepted by the people and taxgatherers but repudiated by the Pharisees and jurists. It is described by Josephus:

> John that was called the Baptist . . . who was a good man and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue both as to righteousness towards one another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing would be acceptable to him if they made use of it, not in order to the demanding pardon for some sins, *but for the purification of the body;* supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness.[8]

Another kind of baptism met with in the New Testament is concerned with the Holy Spirit. It is anticipated in the proclamation of John the Baptist:

> He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit.
> He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire.[9]

It is emphasized by Jesus:

> Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence.[10]

It is described in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles:

> And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And

[7] Mark 1 : 8a; Matt. 3 : 11; Luke 3 : 16; 7 : 29; John 1 : 26, 31, 33a; Acts 1 : 5a; 11 : 16a; 13 : 24; 18 : 25; 19 : 3, 4.

[8] Antiquities, 18 : 5, 2, Margoliouth revision.

[9] Mark 1 : 8b; Matt. 3 : 11b; Luke 3 : 16b; John 1 : 33; Acts 11 : 16b. In case of quotations from the American Standard Text of the Revised Version, permission for their use has been obtained from Thomas Nelson and Sons, owners of the copyright.

[10] Acts 1 : 5b.

there appeared unto them tongues, distributing themselves, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. . . . This is that which hath been spoken through the prophet Joel:

And it shall be in the last days, *saith God,* I will pour forth of my spirit upon all flesh . . . . Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins: *and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*

The practise of a Christian baptism with water is frequently alluded to in the Acts of the Apostles. Philip thus baptized the Ethiopian eunuch. Paul "got up and was baptized." Peter was certain that water for the baptism of Cornelius and others should not be refused. Lydia, the jailer, and their households were baptized at Philippi. Crispus and various other folks at Corinth were baptized. Folks already Christians dwelling at Ephesus were baptized in the name of Jesus." [11]

The baptism with the Spirit both precedes and follows baptism with water. Paul was first filled with the Holy Spirit and only thereupon baptized. Cornelius and others at Cæsarea first received the Holy Spirit and only thereafter and because of this baptism were they baptized with water.[12] In case of the disciples at Ephesus, baptism with the Holy Spirit followed upon baptism with water.[13]

The Gospel of John is chiefly interested in the baptism with the Spirit:

Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples, . . . Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. . . . That which is born of the Spirit is spirit. . . . God is Spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in truth. . . . If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, from within him shall

[11] Acts 2 : 38; 9 : 18; 10 : 47; 16 : 15, 33; 18 : 8; 19 : 5; 2 : 38, 41.
[12] Acts 9 : 17; 10 : 44.
[13] Acts 19 : 6.

flow rivers of living water. But this spoke he of the Spirit which they that believed on him were to receive.[14]

In still another interpretation of baptism found in the New Testament, baptism with water and with the Spirit are associated.[15]

Some members of the Christian church at Corinth were practising a form of vicarious baptism in behalf of the dead. "Else what shall they do that are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them?"[16]

Another variation in the new Testament practise of baptism appears in Acts 18 and 19. Apollos was a Christian. He both preached and taught Christianity. He received further instruction in Christianity from Priscilla and Aquila. He was recommended to the church at Corinth and there wrought. And yet he knew "only the baptism of John." There is no mention of another baptism in his case. Paul met twelve Christians at Ephesus who had not received the Holy Spirit. They were disciples. They had believed. They were genuine Christians. They had become members of the Christian church on the basis of John's baptism. Were they and Apollos the only early disciples received into the fellowship of the Christian church on the basis of John's baptism? Or did the apostles themselves join the Christian church on the same condition? These twelve disciples at Ephesus had not received the Holy Spirit in connection with their baptism. On being baptized into the name of Jesus and after the laying on of hands, "the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied."

A very noticeable variation in early Christian baptism is witnessed to by the formula employed. The primitive formula employed makes use of the name of Jesus Christ or the Lord

[14] John 4 : 2; 3 : 5, 6; 4 : 24; 7 : 37, 38.

[15] 1 Cor. 6 : 11-13; 2 Cor. 1 : 22; Eph. 1 : 13; 4 : 30; 5 : 26; Titus 3 : 5, 6.

[16] 1 Cor. 15 : 29. Ingenious attempts to get rid of the plain implication of this passage may be read in Catholic Encyclopedia, II, 271.

Jesus. Indeed, that simple formula was still valid in the ninth century. In the entire New Testament there is but one reference to the trine or trinitarian formula, and that is the instance of Matthew 28 : 19. To feel the force of this variation, let us gather the New Testament references to the formula employed in baptism:

Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ.
Only they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus.
And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.
And they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus.
Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.
All we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death.
If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord.
I of Christ . . . were ye baptized into the name of Paul?
Ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.
For as many of you as were baptized into Christ.
In whom (Christ), having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.
Do they not blaspheme the honorable name which was called over you.[17]

Only when the period of the Didache and Justin the Martyr is reached is there further support for the trine or Trinitarian formula of Matthew.[18]

At first considerable freedom prevailed in regard to the administration of baptism. The church had not lost its democracy. Apostles, prophets, and teachers were not priests. The administration of baptism was not a clerical but a Christian function. Indeed, the Ethiopian eunuch joined no church upon being baptized by Philip. And Philip was one of the seven and an evangelist but not one of the twelve apostles. Paul baptized only the very first believers at Corinth and seems to have been not at all jealous of his rights.[19]

[17] Acts 2 : 38; 8 : 16; 10 : 48; 19 : 5; 22 : 16; Rom. 6 : 3; 10 : 9; 1 Cor. 1 : 13; 6 : 11; Gal. 3 : 27; Eph. 1 : 13; James 2 : 7.

[18] Didache 7 : 1, 3; Justin, Apology, I, 61.

[19] I Cor. 1 : 13-17. See Calvin, Institutes, IV, 14 : 21ff., and Tertullian, On Baptism, 17.

2. *Variations in the significance of baptism with water* are numerous in the New Testament period.

Josephus understood John's baptism to denote "the purification of the body" after the soul had been "thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness."

Was the baptism by John Christian baptism? John did not regard himself as Elijah. John did no miracle.[20] Elijah was expected to perform miracles. John did not baptize in the name of Jesus. There was no idea of membership in the Christian church associated with John's baptism. John baptized in anticipation of a superior baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire. Only God can forgive sins, the Jews argue.[21] Sins were to be forgiven at the approaching assize.

> The whole baptism of the Messiah, as John conceives it, is a baptism of judgment. . . . The Holy Spirit is a stormy wind of judgment; holy, as sweeping away all that is light and worthless in the nation . . . the fire destroys what the wind leaves. John . . . thinks of three elements as representing functions of himself and of Messiah: water, wind, fire. He baptizes with water, in the roaring stream of Jordan, to emblem the only way of escape, amendment. Messiah will baptize with wind and fire, sweeping away and consuming the impenitent, leaving behind only the righteous.[22]

John's baptism had as its background the last judgment, since both the outpouring of the Spirit according to Joel and the coming of Elijah according to Malachi were to precede that judgment. The entire process, confession of sins, repentance, baptism, guaranteed escape from the judgment.[23]

The Roman Catholic Church discriminates between the baptism by John and Christian baptism:

> If any one saith, that the baptism of John had the same force as the baptism of Christ: let him be anathema.[24]

[20] John 1 : 21; 10 : 41.
[21] Mark 2 : 10.
[22] Bruce, Expositors' Greek New Testament on Matthew 3 : 11.
[23] Matt. 3 : 7; Luke 3 : 7.
[24] Schaff, "Creeds of Christendom," II, 122.

A Baptist confession of faith published by the " remainders of Mr. Smyth's company after his death " affirms,

That John Baptist and Christ are two persons, their ministries are two ministries several, and their baptisms are two baptisms, distinct the one from the other.[25]

John Calvin was of another opinion:

For myself, I grant that the baptism they (the twelve disciples at Ephesus) had received was the true baptism of John, and the very same with the baptism of Christ; but I deny that they were *baptized again.* What is the meaning of these words, " They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus "? Some explain it to be, that they were only instructed by Paul in the pure doctrine; but I prefer understanding it, in a more simple manner, of the baptism of the Holy Spirit; that is, of the visible graces of the Spirit given by the imposition of hands. It is not uncommon in the Scripture to designate those graces by the apellation of *baptism. . . . If ignorance vitiate a first baptism, so that it requires to be corrected by a second, the first persons who ought to have been rebaptized were the apostles themselves, who for three years after their baptism had scarcely any knowledge of the least particle of pure doctrine.*[26]

Historical scholarship recognizes the difference between John's baptism and early Christian baptism.[26a]

The nearest approach to Josephus' understanding of baptism is the statement in the Epistle to the Hebrews:

Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our body washed with pure water.[27]

The description of Pentecost, waiving critical considerations, brings baptism with water into connection with repentance, the name of Jesus, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and fellowship with those awaiting a final judgment in the immediate future.[28]

[25] McGlothlin, " Baptist Confessions of Faith," p. 76.
[26] Institutes, IV, 15 : 18, II, 489.
[26a] Jackson-Lake, " The Beginnings of Christianity," Part I, Vol. 1, p. 334ff, 343ff.
[27] Heb. 10 : 22.
[28] Acts 2 : 38, 41, 42.

The formula employed in Christian baptism signified that the candidate was entering into a relation of dependence upon Jesus and accepting him as Lord.[29]

Because of the association of the Holy Spirit with baptism in the developing Christian church, that rite was regarded as exceedingly meaningful.

It is described as union with the Christian community, and also as representing the unity of Christianity:

> For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one spirit.[29a]

It is pictured as mystical union with Christ:

> Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried, therefore, with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with the likeness of his death we shall also be with the likeness of his resurrection.
>
> For as many as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ.[30]

Baptism is also related to the promise of salvation:

> And such were some of you: but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and into the Spirit of our God.
>
> In whom (Christ) ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you, I say, did he make alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses.
>
> Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the laver of water and the word.
>
> But according to his mercy he saved us, through the laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit.

[29] See Heitmueller, *Im Namen Jesus.*
[29a] 1 Cor. 12 : 13.
[30] Rom. 6 : 3ff; Gal. 3 : 27.

Which (water) also in the antitype doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the appeal of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ.[31]

Baptism is also regarded as a sealing with the Holy Spirit:

Now he that established us with you into Christ and anointed us, is God; who also sealed us, and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.

In whom (Christ) having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.

And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption.[32]

In the Græco-Roman environment, the realism of religious ceremonies was very much in the foreground. It is, therefore, worthy of notice that again and again, the New Testament stresses the ethical element. Christians are buried with Christ through baptism into his death not that they may rise from the dead, but that they may "walk in newness of life."[33] The former would be magical; the latter is ethical. Likewise the Spirit is the "effective principle" in securing the union with the body of Christ.[34] Faith is the means of resurrection with Christ, and God makes alive and forgives trespasses.[35] Christians who might regard baptism and the Lord's Supper as sacraments guaranteeing participation in the joys of Christianity are exhorted to recall the experience of those baptized unto Moses.[36]

Yet the proximity to the magical is vouched for by the practise of vicarious baptism in the church at Corinth. And realism begins to appear through the association of the Holy Spirit with baptism. Paul makes no use of baptism in Romans 3 : 21-26, but he does refer to baptism in a very significant way in Romans 6. Paul's analysis of the redemptive process

[31] 1 Cor. 6 : 11; Col. 2 : 11-13; Eph. 5 : 26; Titus 3 : 5, 6; 1 Peter 3 : 21.
[32] 2 Cor. 1 : 21f.; Eph. 1 : 13; 4 : 30.
[33] Rom. 6 : 4.
[34] 1 Cor. 12 : 13.
[35] Col. 2 : 11-13.
[36] 1 Cor. 10 : 1ff.

can dispense with the mention of baptism and he may boast that his commission read "evangelize" not "baptize," yet his letters also emphasize baptism.

3. *It is generally assumed that Christian baptism was introduced in consequence of a mandate of Christ.*

Two passages from the Gospels are quoted to demonstrate this conclusion. One is found in the Gospel according to Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned."[37] The other supporting text is Matthew 28 : 19:

> Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you.

The quotation from Mark is from the "longer conclusion," which is not the original conclusion of that Gospel. The original conclusion of the Gospel according to Mark has been lost. There remains the mandate of Jesus as recorded in the closing chapter of the Gospel according to Matthew.[38]

What puzzles one, to begin with, is that the earliest Christians seem so utterly unaware of or disobedient to these "marching orders." They make no preparations to go into all the earth. They settle down in Jerusalem. They remain there until the persecution resulting from the radicalism of Stephen compels them to depart from Jerusalem. Even then the apostles are represented as not being scattered abroad.[39] The very persons preeminently under "marching orders" are not going into all the earth.

Somewhat later, Peter must be prepared by a heavenly vision not to regard Gentiles at Cæsarea as unclean. Indeed, the vision had to be repeated thrice and the Spirit had to say

[37] Mark 16 : 16.

[38] Hibbert Journal, Vol. I, No. 1, 3; Rashdall, *Christus in Ecclesia;* article "Baptism" in Hastings' Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, the new Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religion, and the Journal of Theological Studies, 1905 : 481f; F. C. Conybeare, "History of New Testament Criticism," pp. 98-101; Jackson-Lake, "The Beginnings of Christianity," Part 1, Vol. I, p. 335f., especially note 2, p. 336.

[39] Acts 8 : 1.

to Peter: "Behold, three men seek thee. But arise, and get thee down, and go with them, nothing doubting: for I have sent them." [40] The leader of the disciples apparently is unfamiliar with or at least has paid no attention to the final instructions of Jesus.

The fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles describes a conference at Jerusalem between Paul and the chief leaders of the Jerusalem type of Christianity. Gentile missions are being debated. The point in debate is circumcision. How could that rite be in dispute on the basis of the "marching orders"? Moreover, it occurs to no one to quote the commission of Jesus. And the pillar apostles more than a decade and one-half after the death of Jesus and in spite of the final mandate decide to limit themselves to the evangelization of Jews. But the mandate had been given to them long before Paul had ceased being a persecutor. Had they forgotten the last words of their Master?

The synoptic tradition is silent regarding any baptizing by Jesus. Jesus is not described as interested in sacramentalism. The temple appealed to him as a place of prayer. The holy beasts so essential to the sacrificial system and those who converted the coin of the realm into the holy money of the temple were driven away from the temple precincts. The woman taken in adultery, the palsied man, and others were not directed to seek baptism. The twelve disciples were sent forth to cast out demons and heal all manner of disease but not to baptize.[41] No mention was made of baptism, when the seventy were sent forth "whither he himself was about to come." [42] Jesus preached much concerning the kingdom of God and the need of a genuine disposition, but not concerning baptism. When Jesus engaged in colloquy with one who would follow him but only after burying his father, he did not mention baptism. What did Jesus enjoin? "Leave the dead to bury their own dead; *you go and spread the news of the Reign of God.*"

[40] Acts 10 : 9ff. [41] Matthew 10. [42] Luke 10.

In Acts the planting of churches is again and again described without the slightest reference to baptism.[43]

If Paul had known of a commission to baptize enjoined upon the apostles by Jesus, could he have said: "I thank God that I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius. Christ did not send me to baptize but to preach the gospel"—especially when we recall that Paul claimed to be an apostle in the same sense as the twelve?[44]

The Gospel according to John likewise emphasizes that "Jesus baptized not, but his disciples." In the time of Tertullian, some Christians were employing this text to prove that baptism was not necessary.[45]

To be sure, the Gospel of John quotes Jesus as saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."[46] Some regard this reference to water as an addition by one who desired to define the precise moment of regeneration. Others point out that water signifies Spirit in this gospel.[47] Calvin's comment on this verse was:

> In the first place, they are deceived in supposing that this passage refers to baptism, because it mentions water. For, after Christ had declared to Nicodemus the corruption of nature, and shown him the necessity of being born again . . . he here indicates the manner in which God regenerates us, namely, by water and by the Spirit; as if he had said, by the Spirit who, in the ablution and purification of the souls of believers, performs the office of water. *I therefore understand by "water and the Spirit," simply, the Spirit who is water.* Nor is this a novel mode of expression; for it perfectly corresponds with that declaration of John the Baptist, "He that cometh after me shall baptize with the Holy Ghost."[48]

In any case, the ensuing dialogue between Jesus and Nicodemus is unmindful of this mention of water. Only the activity of the Spirit is under review.

[43] Acts 13 : 14.
[44] 1 Cor. 1 : 14-17.
[45] Tertullian, On Baptism, 11.
[46] John 3 : 5.
[47] Cf. John 7 : 38, 39.
[48] Institutes, IV, 16, 25, II, p. 515; see also the Racovian Catechism.

Could such a fundamental commission fail of inclusion in the other Gospels? There is no parallel to the Matthean mandate in either the Gospel according to Luke or the Gospel according to John. Mark's conclusion has disappeared. Now Luke states that the final words of Jesus were:

> Thus it is written that the Christ had to suffer and arise from the dead on the third day, and that *repentance and the remission of sins must be preached in his name to all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem.*[49]

Consider next the first chapter of Acts. Jesus is there pictured as interested in the baptism with the Holy Spirit: "John baptized with water, but not many days after this you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit." The author of Luke and Acts either overlooked or was not sufficiently concerned about the command to baptize to preserve it.

Observe also that the trine formula occurs in Matthew's "marching orders." But of the thirteen or more explicit and implicit references to the formula for baptism in the New Testament, all except one involved Christ or the name of Christ. The exception was seen to be the instance in Matthew. If Jesus issued the trine formula, how could the apostles disobey him and revert to baptism in his name? On the other hand, it is altogether reasonable to expect the developing theology of Christianity to transform the more simple formula into the trine formula. But the original formula was still used in the ninth century.[50]

In the sixty-first chapter of his Apology, Justin, the Martyr, gives an extended description of Christian baptism. Naturally, he cites Scripture texts to support his description. They are, "Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," and a portion of the first chapter of Isaiah.[51] Thereupon, the apologist remarks, "And for this rite, we have learned from the apostles this reason." But the very verse which could have settled the matter of baptism for him—the

[49] Luke 24 : 47. [50] Decision of Pope Nicholas (A. D. 858-867). [51] Isa. 1 : 16-20.

great commission—is precisely the proof-text that Justin does not quote. And by Justin's time the trine formula was customary!

In the Church History of Eusebius of Cæsarea there occurs this sentence:

> But the rest of the apostles, who had been incessantly plotted against with a view to their destruction and had been driven out of the land of Judea, went unto all the nations to preach the gospel, relying upon the power of Christ, who had said to them, "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations in my name." [52]

The exhortation to baptize is lacking. Eusebius quotes the "marching orders" of Christianity more than a score of times. Twenty-one times his quotations fail to mention the baptismal formula. The traditional text of Matthew 28 : 19 is met with in the letter of Eusebius to his church in Cæsarea, written at the time of the Nicene Council and preserved by the church historian, Socrates.[53]

Hence, our conclusion must be that just as the primitive Christians made use of other customs of their religious environment, such as the laying on of hands, for which no word of Jesus can be cited, so they also employed the baptism of their environment, modifying it by the employment of the name of Christ and in the end transforming it by connecting it with the baptism of the Spirit.

III. The Principal Christian Interpretations of Baptism

1. *The form of baptism.*[54]

The question as to the original form of baptism with water no longer necessitates long comment. Baptism originally was

[52] Eusebius, Church History, III, 5 : 2; N. P. N. F., I, p. 138.

[53] Nicene Post Nicene Fathers, II, p. 11; Lake in Hastings' Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, II, p. 380.

[54] I. G. Lawson, "Did Jesus Command Immersion?"; James Mountain, "My Baptism and What Led to It"; J. B. Moody, "Twelve W's of Baptism," p. 104ff; Howard Osgood, "The Archæology of Baptism." In the pre-Christian period the word *baptizo* is used with metaphorical as well as with literal significance. It may denote "overwhelm" as well as "dip." In the entire Greek translation of the Old Testament including the Apocrypha, it occurs but four times: Isa. 21 : 4; 2 Kings 5 : 14; Judith 12 : 7; and Ecclus. 31 : 35. The act of religious washing did not depend upon the employment of the word *baptizo*.

by immersion. The testimony of Calvin, the Book of Common Prayer, and Roman Catholicism should suffice.

Discussing the proper form of baptism, Calvin said:

> But whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed and whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him is of no importance. Churches ought to be left at liberty, in this respect, to act according to the difference of countries. The very word *baptize,* however, signifies to immerse; *and it is certain that immersion was the practise* of the ancient church.[55]

Some seven times the Book of Common Prayer mentions immersion. For example, in case of the public baptism of infants, it says: "And then, naming it after them, he shall *dip* it in the water discreetly, or shall pour water upon it, saying." And immersion is prevailingly mentioned first. The Book of Common Prayer is merely true to its English inheritance. For centuries baptism in England was by immersion and in rivers. The transition to baptisteries in Anglican churches was made by baptisteries outside the churches.[56] As late as the sixteenth century, Erasmus asserts the immersion of infants in England. Trine immersion was prescribed by Henry VIII in 1530. Both Elizabeth and Edward were immersed. Queen Mary [57] did not interfere with the custom of immersion. The change from immersion to affusion occurred just a little later when the Marian exiles returned from Geneva with the new mode of baptism. A memorandum by John Wesley in his own handwriting indicates that the tradition persisted to the eighteenth century.

> Mary Welsh, aged eleven days, was baptized, Saturday, February 21, 1736, according to the custom of the first church and the rule of the Church of England, *by immersion.*[58]

[55] Institutes, IV, 15 : 19.

[56] Cutting, "Historical Vindications," Appendix, I, note B; Norman Fox, *Baptist Review,* 1882, "Rise of the Use of Pouring and Sprinkling for Baptism."

[57] 1553-1558.

[58] The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, I. p. 24.

Roman Catholicism has no hesitancy in summarizing the story of Christian baptism in this wise:

Three forms of ablution have prevailed among Christians, and the Church holds them all to be valid because they fulfill the requisite signification of the baptismal laving. These forms are immersion, infusion, aspersion. *The most ancient form usually employed was unquestionably immersion.* This is not only evident from the writings of the Fathers and the early rituals of both the Latin and Oriental churches, but it can also be gathered from the Epistles of St. Paul, who speaks of baptism as a bath.[59] In the Latin Church immersion seems to have prevailed until the twelfth century. After that time it is found in some places even as late as the sixteenth century. Infusion and aspersion, however, were growing common in the thirteenth century and gradually prevailed in the Western Church. The Oriental Churches have retained immersion, though not always in the sense of plunging the candidate's entire body below the water.[60]

Three eminent witnesses will next be heard. The first is the unknown author of the Epistle of Barnabas, who wrote early in the second Christian century:

He means to say that we go down into the water full of sins and foulness, and we come up leaving the fruit of fear in our hearts, and having hope in Jesus in the Spirit.[61]

The second ancient witness is the author of the Shepherd of Hermas, a mid-second-century apocalypse:

So these also who had fallen asleep received the seal of the Son of God and entered into the kingdom of God. For before, said he, a man bears the name of the Son of God, he is dead. But when he receives the seal, he puts away mortality and receives life. The seal, then, is the water. They go down, then, into the water dead, and come up alive.[62]

Tertullian, writing about one-half a century later, remarked:

[59] Eph. 5 : 26; Rom. 6 : 4; Titus 3 : 5.
[60] Catholic Encyclopedia, II, p. 261ff.
[61] Epistle of Barnabas, 11.
[62] Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes, IX, 16.

When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil and his pomp and his angels. Hereupon we are *thrice immersed,* making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the Gospel.[63]

All this does not warrant the conclusion that other forms of baptism were not in vogue in the ancient church. In a Christian manual known as the *Didache,* or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, and assigned to the early part of the second century, there is a description of baptism which authorizes departure from the customary rite.

Concerning baptism, baptize thus: Having first rehearsed all these things, "baptize in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," in running water, but if thou hast no running water, baptize in other water, and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. *But if thou has neither, pour water three times on the head* in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." And before the baptism let the baptizer and him who is to be baptized fast, and any others who are able. And thou shalt bid him who is to be baptized to fast one or two days before.[64]

2. The emergence and practise of infant baptism.[65]

The first witness to infant baptism is by some held to be Irenæus on the basis of the following sentence:

For he came to save all by means of himself—all, I say, who through him are regenerated unto God—*infants* and children and boys and youths and old men.[66]

For it is pointed out that Irenæus equated baptism with "regenerated unto God."

Tertullian, by insisting that the "baptism of little children (those incapable of making personal profession of faith), should be postponed until they know Christ," indicates beyond a doubt that infant baptism was being practised in his environment.[67]

[63] Tertullian, The Chaplet, III.
[64] Chapter VII.
[65] William Wall, "The History of Infant Baptism," I, II.
[66] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* II, 22. A. N. F. I., 391, cf. III, 17 : 1.
[67] Tertullian, On Baptism, 18.

For Origen, infant baptism was "apostolic usage," since it had been "received from the apostles to give baptism to little children." The apostolic order to baptize infants, Origen says, was due to this, that

> they to whom the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit: by reason of which the body itself is also called the body of sin.[68]

In the time of Cyprian the question debated was whether infant baptism may properly be administered immediately after birth:

> We read your letter, most dear brother [Fidus], in which you write of one Victor, a priest . . . But as to the case of infants; whereas you judge that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born; and that the rule of circumcision is to be observed, so that *none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born: we were all in our assembly of the contrary opinion.* . . .
>
> This, therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in the assembly: that it is not for us to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind and affectionate to all. Which rule, as it holds for all, *so we think it more especially to be observed in reference to infants and persons newly born: to whom our help and the divine mercy is rather to be granted, because by their weeping and wailing at their first entrance into the world, they do intimate nothing so much as that they implore compassion.*[69]

Although infant baptism was becoming customary in the third century, it was not enjoined. In the fourth century it was still necessary for Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil to plead that baptism be not postponed. Both Basil and Chrysostom state that any time in life is proper for baptism.[70] Pelagius denied the damnation of unbaptized infants. Augustine contends that the whole church practises infant baptism, and that it seems to have apostolic sanction:

[68] Commentary on Romans, lib. V, c. 9.
[69] A. N. F. V., p. 353.
[70] Wall, "Infant Baptism," Chapters X–XIV.

Which the whole body of the church holds, as delivered to them, in the case of little infants baptized; who certainly cannot yet believe with the heart to righteousness, or confess with the mouth to salvation . . . Nay, by their crying and noise while the sacrament is administering, they disturb the holy mysteries; and yet no Christian man will say they are baptized to no purpose.

And if any one do ask for divine authority in this matter: *though that which the whole church practises, and which has not been instituted by council, but was ever in use, is very reasonably believed to be no other than a thing ordered by authority of the apostles.*[71]

The Syrian church made infant baptism obligatory about the middle of the fifth century.[72]

3. The fully developed Roman Catholic theory of baptism, as formulated by the Council of Trent, may be thus summarized:[73]

If any one denies, that, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted . . . let him be anathema . . . But this holy synod confesses and is sensible that in the baptized there remains concupiscence, or an incentive to sin.

The baptism of John was not Christian baptism. True and natural water are necessary for baptism. The Roman Church has the true doctrine of baptism. Baptism given by heretics "with the intention of doing what the church doth" is true baptism. Baptism is necessary to salvation. The baptized can lose grace. Baptism involves the observance of the whole law. Baptism does not free from either written or transmitted precepts of the holy Church. The promise made in baptism does not make vows made after baptism void. Remembrance and the faith of the baptism received do not remit or make venial postbaptismal sins. Valid baptism cannot be repeated. Baptism is not to be postponed to the age of Christ's baptism or to death. Baptized infants are to be reckoned among the faith-

[71] "Against the Donatists," IV, 23, 24.

[72] Proof-texts employed to demonstrate the scripturalness of infant baptism: 1 Cor. 7 : 14; Luke 18 : 15; Col. 2 : 11, 12; Acts 16 : 15, 33; 1 Cor. 1 : 16; John 3 : 5; Acts 15; Eph. 5 : 26; Titus 3 : 5.

[73] Schaff, "Creeds of Christendom," II, 87, 88, 122ff., 174.

ful. Infants are not to be rebaptized on reaching the years of discretion. Infants are baptized in the faith alone of the church. Children on growing up are not to be asked whether they will ratify the promises of their sponsors or to be left to their own will in the matter of baptism.

Roman Catholicism regards baptism as necessary for all:

> The Catholic teaching is uncompromising on this point (unbaptized infants), that all who depart this life without baptism, be it of water, or blood, or desire, are perpetually excluded from the vision of God.[74]

The regular administrator of baptism in Roman Catholicism is the bishop or parish priest. A deacon may administer baptism by special appointment. But, when necessary, baptism may be administered validly by "any Catholic layman, other man, a woman, heretic, or schismatic, infidel or Jew." Conditional baptism is for those regarding whose baptism there is any doubt.

What does Roman Catholicism think of the baptism practised by various groups of Christians? Both the Oriental Churches and the Old Catholics administer a valid baptism:

> As to the baptism of the various sects . . . the Socinians and Quakers do not baptize at all; *the Baptists use the rite only for adults, and the efficacy of their baptism has been called in question, owing to the separation of the matter and the form, for the latter is pronounced before the immersion takes place;* the Congregationalists, Unitarians, and Universalists deny the necessity of baptism, and hence the presumption is that they do not administer it accurately; the Methodists and Presbyterians baptize by aspersion or sprinkling, and it may be reasonably doubted *whether the water has washed the body and flowed upon it;* among the Episcopalians many consider baptism to have no true efficacy and to be merely an empty ceremony, and consequently there is a well-grounded fear that they are not sufficiently careful in its administration. To this may be added, that Episcopalians often baptize by aspersion, and though such a method is undoubtedly valid if properly employed, yet in practice it is quite possible that the sprinkled water may not touch the skin.[75]

[74] Catholic Encyclopedia, II, 266.
[75] Ibid. p. 264.

4. *Earlier Protestant interpretations of baptism.*

Harnack has called attention to the logical consequences of the fundamental contention of Protestantism in a statement that has become a classic:

If the fundamental evangelical and Lutheran principle is valid, that grace and faith are inseparably interrelated ("In the absence of faith, baptism continues to be only a bare and ineffectual sign,"), then infant baptism is in itself no sacrament, but an ecclesiastical observance; if it is in the strict sense a sacrament, then that principle is no longer valid. This dilemma can be escaped neither by a reference to the faith of the sponsors, parents, etc. (thus Luther himself at the first)—for that is the worst form of *fides implicita;* nor by the assumption that in baptism faith is given—for an unconscious faith, is an almost equally bad species of that *fides implicita.* It would only have been in accordance, therefore, with the evangelical principle, either to do away with infant baptism . . . or to declare it to be an ecclesiastical observance, which only received its true import afterwards.[76]

The Lutheran interpretation of baptism may be inferred from Luther's Small Catechism, the Augsburg Confession, and the Saxon Visitation Articles:

What does baptism give, or of what use is it?

It worketh forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to all who believe, as the Word and promise of God declare. . . .

How can water do such great things?

It is not water, indeed, that does it, but the Word of God *which is with and in the water,* and faith, which trusts in the Word of God *in the water.*[77]

Of baptism they teach that it is necessary to salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is offered, and that children are to be baptized, who by baptism, being offered to God, are received unto God's favor.

They condemn the Anabaptists, who allow not the baptism of children and affirm that children are saved without baptism.[78]

There is but one baptism and one ablution . . . which washes us from our sins. . . . Baptism is the bath of regeneration, because in it we are born again, and sealed by the Spirit of adoption gratuitously.[79]

[76] Harnack, "History of Dogma," VII, 251.
[77] Schaff, "Creeds of Christendom," III, 85 : 86.
[78] Ibid, III, p. 13.
[79] Ibid, III, p. 183.

The attitude of the Reformed Church toward baptism is discoverable from the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism:

Christ has substituted baptism for circumcision by which we are received into the church of God, and separated from all other people and strange religions . . . as water . . . is seen on the body of the baptized . . . so doth the blood of Christ by the power of the Holy Ghost, internally sprinkle the soul, cleanse it from its sins, and regenerate us from children of wrath into children of God.[80]

Is, then, the outward washing of water itself the washing away of sins?

No; for only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit cleanse us from all sin. . . .

Are infants also to be baptized?

Yes; for since they, as well as their parents, belong to the covenant and people of God, and both redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost, who works faith, are through the blood of Christ promised to them no less than to their parents, they are also by baptism, as a sign of the covenant, to be ingrafted into the Christian Church, and distinguished from the children of unbelievers, as was done in the Old Testament by circumcision, in place of which in the New Testament baptism is appointed.[81]

Baptism was defined in the Westminster Confession of Faith as

a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life. . . . *Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary* . . . infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized . . . grace and salvation *are not so inseparably annexed unto it, so that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.* . . . The sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered to any person.[82]

The twenty-seventh of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England is devoted to a description of baptism:

[80] Ibid, III, 425f. [81] Ibid, III, p. 329ff. [82] Ibid, III, p. 661.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new-birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.[83]

5. *The criticism and rejection of infant baptism.*

A few years after Martin Luther posted his famous theses, Anabaptism appeared in Switzerland and vicinity. There is scarcely an early Protestant confession of faith which does not condemn Anabaptism. Some of the reformers regarded them as perfectly hopeless in their invincible fanaticism, as delirious, seditious, and anarchic. For almost a century no history of the Anabaptists doing them justice because written from their point of view was given to the world, whereas a formidable attack was made upon them in printed form within two decades after their emergence, and remained the chief source-book upon the subject for centuries.[84] Church histories of half a century ago were classifying them under the "deformation of the Reformation." It remained for modern historians to appreciate the reasons for the rise of Anabaptism.

The Anabaptists were Biblical literalists, seeking to organize a spiritual, regenerate church, composed of believers only. They insisted that religion must be free, that Christ must be taken literally, and that Christians must oppose war and some of the practises of civil life. They favored communism, and some of them practised it. They became convinced that infant baptism was contrary to the New Testament and therefore repudiated infant baptism. They "affirmed that children are saved without baptism." They were not quarreling about the *mode* of baptism but about the *person* who should be bap-

[83] Ibid, III, 504.
[84] 1615, Hans de Ries; 1545, Herman Kerssenbroick.

tized. Hence they impressed their contemporaries as being *repeaters of baptism.*

Indeed, as a rule, these continental Anabaptists employed pouring as the mode of baptism. One of their leaders, Hübmaier, defined baptism as to "pour outward water over the confessor of his sins." On one occasion Hübmaier "called his followers together, and having sent for a *pail of water,* solemnly baptized three hundred persons at one time." There are many references to "handfuls" of water. The Mennonites continued this custom of pouring.

There were also instances of immersion, as when Conrad Grebel met one who "would not simply be poured upon with water out of a dish, but, *being entirely naked,* was pressed down and covered over in the Rhine." *Later,* Anabaptists employing immersion as the mode of baptism were found in Poland, Silesia, and the Baltic region. Unitarian Polish Anabaptists brought immersion to Holland. About 1620, the Collegiants arose, who

> had no such thing as membership in a strict sense, but practised immersion, kept baptismal registers, and baptized candidates into the Church of Christ universal.

The "Seven Articles of Swabian and Swiss Anabaptists" of 1527, the *Rechenschaft unserer Religion* by Peter Riedemann of 1545, and the Mennonite statement of about 1580 are quoted to describe the continental Anabaptist attitude toward infant baptism: [85]

> First learn concerning baptism! Baptism ought to be administered to all who have been taught repentance and a change of life and in truth believe their sins to have been blotted out through Christ, and who wholly wish to be buried with him into death that they may be able to rise again with him. To all, then, who ask baptism after this manner and make the request for themselves we administer it. By these means are excluded all baptism of infants, the supreme abomination of the Roman pontiff. . . .

[85] McGlothlin, "Baptist Confessions of Faith," pp. 3, 14, 42.

Only those who truly repent are to be baptized; the candidate kneels while the administrator pours water upon him, repeating the words, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who according to thy faith hath forgiven thee thy sins and drawn thee into his kingdom and accepted thee, therefore sin henceforth no more, so that no worse thing befall thee."

Holy baptism is an external, visible, and evangelical action, in which, according to Christ's precept and the practise of the apostles, for a holy end, are baptized in water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, those who hear, believe, and freely receive in a penitent heart the doctrine of the holy gospel, for such Christ commanded to be baptized, but by no means infants.

Another rejection of infant baptism and insistence upon believers' baptism originated among English folks early in the seventeenth century. Toward the end of the sixteenth century, Congregationalism emerged. Among its principles were these:

Any company of true believers constitutes a true church of Christ; a church is constituted by a public covenant between God and his people, and Christian fellowship is a privilege and a duty.

Early in the seventeenth century John Smyth, a graduate of the University of Cambridge, was associated with a separatist group at Gainsborough. English governmental intolerance compelled the followers of Smyth to seek asylum in Holland. The validity of infant baptism became a subject for discussion, since the "churches of the apostolique constitution" were composed of "saints only." In 1609 Smyth boldly rejected infant baptism and proceeded to baptize himself and others as well. Again it was not the mode of baptism that was in dispute, it was not the quantity of water to be employed in the rite of baptism that underlay all this discussion. It was the matter of the person who should be baptized that constituted the issue. The question was, Who are proper subjects of baptism? The answer was, Such as have made personal experience of God's grace. The point was that an infant could not appreciate what was being done. The candidate for baptism must personally request baptism.

That Smyth administered baptism to himself by affusion is now conceded.[86] The first Baptist confession of faith to prescribe dipping is the Calvinistic Baptist confession of the year 1644. Some General or Arminian English Baptists were employing affusion as late as 1653. The first Arminian Baptist confession of faith to refer to immersion is that of the year 1660. The introduction of immersion as the form of baptism was due to the Particular or Calvinistic Baptists, and occurred during the fifth decade of the seventeenth century. The Jessey Church records and the so-called "Kiffin manuscript" make this plain. There is also other evidence of various kinds, such as the appearance of the designation "Baptist," schism over the question of the mode of baptism, severance of relations with the Mennonites, the emergence of "rhantize" as a label of infant baptism in the course of that fifth decade, to sustain the conclusion. Add to all this the seven Baptist witnesses and several alien witnesses and the case for the late origin of immersion is complete.[87]

The more pertinent statements in the various Baptist confessions of faith concerning baptism follow:

> The outward baptism of water, is to be administered only upon such penitent and faithful persons as are (aforesaid), and not upon innocent infants, or wicked persons.
>
> On baptism to the penitent person, and believer, there is presented, and figured, the spiritual baptism of Christ, (that is) the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and fire; the baptism into the death and resurrection of Christ; even the promise of the Spirit, which he shall assuredly be made partaker of, if he continue to the end. [88]
>
> The baptism or washing with water, is the outward manifestation of dying into sin, and walking in newness of life. And therefore in no wise appertaineth to infants.[89]

[86] Whitsitt, "A Question"; A. H. Newman, "History of the Baptists," pp. 41ff., 49f; Vedder, "Baptists" in "Americana" and elsewhere; McGlothlin, "Guide," p. 175f.; Shakespeare, "Baptist and Congregational Pioneers"; etc.

[87] Whitsitt, "A Question," pp. 111ff.

[88] Between 1612-1614 by "Remainders of Mr. Smyth's Company after his death." McGlothlin, "Baptist Confessions of Faith," p. 79.

[89] Helwys, 1611; ibid, p. 89.

Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament given by Christ, to be dispensed only upon persons professing faith, or that are disciples, or taught, who upon a profession of faith, ought to be baptized.

The way and manner of the dispensing of this ordinance the Scripture hold out to be dipping or plunging the whole body under water; it being a sign, must answer the thing signified, which are these: first, the washing the whole soul in the blood of Christ; secondly, that interest the saints have in the death, burial, and resurrection; thirdly, together with a confirmation of our faith, that as certainly as the body is buried under water, and riseth again, so certainly shall the bodies of the saints be raised by the power of Christ, in the day of the resurrection, to reign with Christ.[90]

The way and manner of baptizing, both before the death of Christ, and since his resurrection and ascension, was to go into the water, and to be baptized.[91]

It is the duty of every man and woman, that have repented from dead works, and have faith towards God, to be baptized, that is—dipped or buried under the water, in the *name of our Lord Jesus,* or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, therein to signify and represent a washing away of sin, and their death, burial, and resurrection with Christ, and being thus planted in the visible church or body of Christ, who are a company of men and women separated out of the world by the preaching of the gospel, to walk together in communion in all the commandments of Jesus.[92]

The right and only way of gathering churches (according to Christ's appointment) is to teach, or preach the gospel to the sons and daughters of men; and then to *baptize* (that is in English to dip) in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, *or in the name of the* Lord Jesus Christ, such only of them, as profess repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.[93]

Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized, a sign of his fellowship with him, in his death, and resurrection; of his being engrafted unto him; of remission of sins; and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life.

Those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in, and obedience, to our Lord Jesus, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance.

[90] Calvinistic Baptists, 1644, "first Confession of history to prescribe a single immersion as the form of baptism." Ibid, p. 185; marginal note on *baptizo.*

[91] Arminian Baptists, 1651; ibid, 103.

[92] Calvinistic English Baptists, 1656; ibid, 208.

[93] Arminian English Baptists, 1660; ibid, p. 115; the first General Baptist confession of faith to prescribe immersion.

The outward element to be used in this ordinance is water, wherein the party is to be baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Immersion, or dipping of the person in water, is necessary to the due administration of this ordinance.[94]

Those two ordinances, viz., baptism and the Lord's Supper, are ordinances of positive, sovereign, and holy institution, appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ, the only lawgiver, to be continued in his church, to the end of the world; and to be administered by those only who are rightly qualified, and thereunto called, according to the command of Christ.

We do believe, that all little children, dying in their infancy, viz., before they are capable to choose either good or evil, *whether born of believing parents or unbelieving* parents, shall be saved by the grace of God and the merit of Christ their redeemer, and work of the Holy Ghost. . . . we conclude, that that opinion is false, which saith, that those little infants dying before baptism, are damned.[95]

We believe, that it is the indispensable duty of all who repent and believe the gospel, to be baptized, by immersion in water, in order to be initiated to a church state; and that no person ought to be received into the church without submission to that ordinance.[96]

Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water, in the name of the Father, Son and Spirit, to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem, our faith in a crucified, buried, and risen Saviour, *with its purifying power;* that it is a prerequisite to the privileges of the church relation; and to the Lord's Supper.[97]

Christian baptism is the immersion of believers in water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in which are represented their death to the world, the washing of their souls from the pollutions of sin, their resurrection to newness of life, the burial and resurrection of Christ, their resurrection at the last day, and their engagement to serve God . . .

Washing the saints' feet is an example that was set by our Lord, and enjoined on his disciples to teach them humility.[98]

[94] Calvinistic English Baptists, 1677, 1693, etc., *refused reaffirmation* in 1888. This confession is the Westminster Confession except in case of the church and ordinances. The Philadelphia Confession *repeats* substantially.

[95] Arminian English Baptists, 1678; ibid, 144, 157.

[96] New Connection, 1770; ibid, p. 166—this confession had to be subscribed *by ministers.* Required in 1770. *Half a decade later subscription was regarded as "not needful."*

[97] New Hampshire Confession, 1833, etc., ibid, 306.

[98] Free Will Baptists, 1834, ibid, p. 326. For German Baptists, see p. 340; for French Baptists, p. 359; for Swedish Baptists, p. 367, cf. McGlothlin, "Confessions of Faith." Alexander Campbell held that the way of salvation was: Faith, repentance, immersion, remission of sins, and reception of the Holy Spirit.

6. *The criticism and rejection of baptism with water.*

As early as the time of Tertullian, some Christians regarded baptism with water as unnecessary. They advanced at least four arguments: Since Abraham was justified by faith without submission to baptism and Christians are likewise justified by faith, they need no baptism. Paul would not have stated that he was not sent to baptize, were baptism necessary. The apostles were not baptized. And Christ himself did not baptize. To be sure, his disciples did, but that does not make baptism obligatory upon the Christian.[99]

The rejection of baptism with water was debated in later times as well.[100] Socinus did not consider baptism as a "perpetual ordinance" of the church.

> Water baptism seems unnecessary *for those that are born of Christians,* and do imitate their parents in the profession of Christianity. *It matters not whether such be baptized or not. And if they be, it is all one whether it be at their adult age or in infancy.*[101]

The twelfth proposition of the apology of Robert Barclay, 1675, states the position of the Friends:

> As there is one Lord, and one faith, so there is "one baptism; which is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience before God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." *And this baptism is a pure and spiritual thing, to wit, the baptism of the Spirit and Fire,* by which we are buried with him, that, being washed and purged from our sins, we may "walk in newness of life"; of which the baptism of John was a figure, which was commanded for a time, and not to continue forever.
>
> As to the baptism of infants, it is a mere human tradition, for which neither precept nor practise is to be found in the scripture.[102]

The Friends urge the

absence of all outward ordinances, including baptism and the Supper, on the ground that they are not essential, were not commanded by Christ,

[99] Tertullian, On Baptism.
[100] Wall, "History of Infant Baptism," Chapter V.
[101] Ibid, p. 16.
[102] Schaff, "Creeds of Christendom," III, p. 797.

and moreover tend to draw the soul away from the essential to the non-essential and formal.[103]

The followers of Mother Ann Lee, commonly called Shakers, did not require baptism at all.[104]

The Salvation Army

in its attitude toward the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper is neutral, acting in harmony with the followers of George Fox in regarding the sacraments that save as spiritual.[105]

Christian Science puts the case this way:

Baptism, Pacification by Spirit, submergence in Truth.

The baptism of Spirit, washing the body of all impurities of flesh, signifies that such as see God are approaching spiritual Life and its demonstration.[106]

IV. Some Present Aspects of the Theory and Practise of Christian Baptism

The present era is one of discovery and bewilderment. Surprise is continuous in the modern world. Conclusions hoary with age have vanished as if by magic. Confessions of faith have had their sources traced and their mutual dependence demonstrated. Creeds are valuable

as records of important battles of thought in the life of the church and as registers of decisions reached. . . . But though we take a curious interest in the charts and maps of the men of the seventeenth century, yet we do not use them in crossing the seas.

Few of the customs transmitted from the past have escaped the revealing search-light of this modern quest for facts and reality. Men are constantly saying, Why should ideas and methods and types of organization acknowledged to be very useful for the protection of Christianity at the time of their birth be imposed upon the church of the twentieth century?

[103] U. S. Religious Census, 1916, II, p. 294.
[104] Ibid, p. 232.
[105] Ibid, p. 660.
[106] "Science and Health," p. 560, p. 137.

And thus it has come to pass that the theory and practise of baptism have also come under review as of practical interest once more.

The modern age is freeing itself from conformity to ceremony. There is much variation in the mode of baptism. Older interpretations lack vigorous defense, even when older forms are continued. Parents do not understand the "theology" of baptism. Sermons upon baptism are rarely preached. Economic considerations are urging rural communities not to make baptism a reason for antagonism and disintegration. The incoming generation is not so seriously concerned over these questions which caused their fathers to joke each other in public over the quantity of water used in baptism. Isolated instances of this "weakening" were discoverable half a century ago. At present they appear everywhere. Indeed, the center of gravity has shifted so much during the modern epoch that outside of the denomination, Baptists are often viewed as mere literalists, "biblicists" and "sacramentarians" because of their emphasis upon immersion. They are accused of being unable to "surrender a mere form even for the sake of the eternal Spirit." Occasionally they are reminded that Baptist consistency requires the acknowledgment of the freedom of believers from every sort of sacramentalism.

"What is baptism?" asked Robertson of Brighton, and he replied,

> "The authoritative declaration of a fact." "What fact?" "That I am God's child." "Why, then, do you say that I am so made, in baptism?" "By made, I mean declared to be." For example, "as soon as a king dies, his successor is king. *Coronation declares the fact,* but does not *make* him king. He was one before but it corroborates, declares, affirms, seals the fact by a recognized form used for that purpose." [107]

Baptism is not made a requisite to membership, although it is often urged upon believers as a duty. While immersion is generally practised, no one mode is insisted upon.[108]

[107] Stopford Brooke, "Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson," II, 341ff.
[108] Christian Church (American Christian Convention).

The question of baptism of children is left to the choice of the parents . . . the mode of baptism to the judgment of the individual.[109]

Baptism is not required, in each case the mode of baptism is that which the candidate decides to be scriptural.[110]

Infant baptism is customary; the form is optional.[111]

The baptism of adults is rare, that of infants is the rule. Some ministers do not use water but hold a service of dedication. That service has a twofold significance, thanksgiving for the child and its devotion to God.[112]

Baptism is administered both to infants and adults; as to mode, sprinkling is preferred, though in the case of adult converts, choice of sprinkling, pouring, or immersion is given.[113]

He [the modern churchman] perceives the dangers which may adhere to them [the sacraments] from materialistic, mechanical, and magical interpretations, to which they are peculiarly prone, and so he is urgently anxious that there shall be nothing of a sub-Christian character about them. They are capable of an interpretation and use which is spiritual, moral, rational—Christian in the highest sense—and it is extraordinarily necessary today that our teaching about them should never, as it so easily may, fall below that level. If it does we . . . discredit Christianity itself.[114]

And what is the present position of Baptists regarding baptism?

European Baptists continue rigidly to insist upon the strict observance of the ordinance.

Baptism has the peculiarity that it should be administered only once, while the other means of grace are repeated and renewed throughout the whole life of the Christian; therefore it is especially necessary that this ordinance should be rightly performed.[115]

We believe, after the order of Christ, his example and that of the apostles, that the *immersion of believers must precede admission into the local church and participation in the communion.*[116]

[109] United Brethren in Christ.
[110] Christian Union.
[111] Congregationalism.
[112] Hall, "Fifty Points in Favor of Unitarianism."
[113] Methodist Episcopal Church, U. S. Religious Census, 1916, II, p. 449.
[114] Major in *Modern Churchman*, September, 1925, p. 410ff.
[115] Baptists of Germany, McGlothlin, "Baptist Confessions of Faith," p. 341.
[116] Union of the Baptist Churches of France, ibid, p. 359.

We believe that baptism . . . is properly administered only through the immersion of the whole person in water; and that it should precede admittance into the fellowship of the church and participation in the Lord's supper.[117]

A committee of the Southern Baptist Convention defined a church of Jesus Christ to be

A body of *immersed* believers, united under the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the worship of God, for spiritual edification and growth, *for the observance of the ordinances,* for the spread of the gospel, and for the establishment of the kingdom of Christ in the earth, [adding] a church has no right to take from or add to the revealed will of Christ recorded in the New Testament.[118]

The Baptist Bible Union affirms

that Christian baptism is the immersion in water of a believer into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; to show forth, in a solemn and beautiful emblem our faith in the crucified, buried, and risen Saviour, with its effect in our death to sin, and resurrection to a new life; *that it is prerequisite to the privileges of a church relation and to the Lord's Supper.*[119]

The proposed amendment to the constitution of the Northern Baptist Convention reads:

A Baptist church, as defined for the purposes of these By-laws, is one accepting the New Testament as its guide and composed only of baptized believers, baptism being by immersion.[120]

But there are also numerous Baptist churches in the world that no longer insist upon immersion as a prerequisite for Christian fellowship. The various plans affording expression of this attitude are known as "Associate Membership," "Congregational Membership," "Full Membership," and "Open Membership." "Associate, affiliated, or fellowship" membership involves some curtailment of the rights and privileges of

[117] Swedish Baptists, ibid, p. 367.
[118] Fraternal Address of Southern Baptists.
[119] *Christian Work,* 116: 702, May 31, 1924; Vanderlaan, "Fundamentalism versus Modernism," p. 24. *Does not this preclude a cross-section of Fundamentalists?*
[120] Annual of Northern Baptist Convention, 1925, p. 245.

unimmersed members of evangelical churches other than Baptist received by letter or upon experience. "Congregational Membership" admits such persons to membership in the society as discriminated from the church. "Full Membership" places no restrictions upon such persons. "Open Membership" refuses to base membership upon baptism. The last mentioned interpretation of baptism makes that rite an "individual matter apart from church-membership," an affair "between the individual and his Lord." It holds that

> to make baptism obligatory for church-membership is ceremonialism, a lingering remnant of Romanism, having no warrant in the New Testament and not in line with early Baptist history. We do not object to "strict membership" merely because it keeps people out of the church, but chiefly because *it results in a merely formal baptism in many instances—a baptism which has no religious or spiritual value.*

Dr. Newton H. Marshall put it, "Had I not been admitted to church-membership before baptism, I should never have become a Baptist." [121]

What have the practical results of these newer forms of membership in Baptist churches been? John Clifford may answer for the English Baptists:

> It [open membership] has aided the growth and increased the influence of Baptists in England. In considering our rate of progress, American Baptists generally forget that the Angelican church is the church of the State and of society, and that Baptists are ostracized and persecuted.

The following summary presents the verdicts of various Baptist ministers in the United States who have had some practical experience with these newer types of church-membership:

[121] See article in "Proceedings of Baptist Congress," Vol. 30, 1912, p. 44ff. It should be added that much confusion exists in the use of the terminology of "full" and "open" membership. Often "full" membership is identified with "open" membership. Neither does "open membership" signify the practise of baptism in two forms. All Baptists are convinced that only immersion was the New Testament mode of baptism. "Open membership" denies that baptism is an ecclesiastical, initiatory rite, a prerequisite for church-membership. It defines baptism as an individual act of obedience rather than an ecclesiastical requirement.

Some of the best folks in our church came to us through this method. We never could have secured the one hundred per cent. on the New World Movement without this plan.

We have found that it works very well, bringing members of the same family into the same church, giving them a common interest that they would not otherwise have. This plan has brought us some of our finest members—loyal, devoted, Christlike people.

We have found the plan especially helpful in uniting families whose members have belonged to different denominations. *Almost without exception, the children of such families, when they come to the age of decision, are immersed and become members of the church.*

It is safe to say that all believe in this plan who have given it the test of experience.

It has been our uniform experience that this has worked advantageously. In case of divided families, where the wife or husband only is a Baptist, it made it possible for them to come in as a united family, and in such cases the children almost invariably are immersed into the church.

It is very satisfactory. It has generated a fine spirit of fellowship and cooperation among us, *ten denominations being represented in our membership* and everybody works together in splendid shape.

The plan has been in operation about three years, and even those who were doubtful about its wisdom at the beginning are now fully persuaded of its value. *So far from weakening the Baptist spirit in the church, it has strengthened it.*

We receive into full membership, with no restrictions whatever, any persons presenting a letter in good standing from any evangelical church. This practise has in no way jeopardized Baptist practises. Open membership has made our church one of the strongest rural churches in the State and all members are loyal to the denominational activities.

Our church could not have lived without the plan. We have never had the least trouble. Financially and in every other way the members coming in this way are a loyal and splendid group.

Some of our best members are found among the Associate Members. One especially is our best Sunday-school teacher, and has no desire to be immersed although her husband and her two sons have been immersed.

I believe that the church of our Master should make Christian character the only test of church-membership.

It certainly has not lowered interest in baptism. *The average number of baptisms per year for ten years before we had it was* 56.7; *since we have had it,* 86.3.

It received a unanimous vote. How is it working out? The secretary of our Y. M. C. A. is a Baptist; his wife was a Methodist. They have both come into our membership. They have six beautiful children. I expect to baptize the oldest of these children before long. All of the children will grow up in our church, uniting by baptism. This means a fine family conserved to our Baptist work.

Many of our young people marry into other communions, and unless we make some provision for the other party, we almost always lose our own member to the other denomination. It is the only "comeback" we have for the great number of our people who are annually absorbed by other denominations.

In conclusion. One's attitude toward baptism will finally depend upon one's attitude toward Jesus. Regard Jesus as a literalist and a ceremonialist, and the gospel becomes a new law. But then consistency requires the practice of the laying on of hands, feet-washing, the literal observance of all the exhortations recorded in Matthew 5 to 7, the communism of Acts, the premillenarianism of the New Testament in general, the limitation of communion to the successors of the apostles, the refusal of titles—to mention only a few of the consequences of literalism.

Literalism reduces the teachings of Jesus to puzzles and misses his principal point, namely, that man must judge for himself what is right. Often those who have most desired to be obedient to Jesus later in life discovered that they had opposed his ideal. Some of the most genuine disciples of Jesus have never found the path to the chief purpose of Jesus because insistence upon the letter blinded them. The fundamental error underlying many erroneous interpretations of Jesus has been the assumption that Jesus was a legalist. But religion was not a system for Jesus. His gospel was not a matter of rules and regulations. He was attempting to transmit an ideal and not a program. He was a prophet. He was interested in disposition and character, not outward observance and ceremony. He was proclaiming the religion of the spirit. So many fasts, so many prayers, so many marks for attendance

at sacrifice, so many gifts laid upon the altar, phylacteries, fringes, correct color—all this placing of the cultus in the midst, this was not characteristic of him. He did not establish a priesthood. His emphasis was ethical.

In the end, then, the upshot of the matter is this: The Christian idealist is more in harmony with the spirit of Jesus than is the rigid ceremonialist and literalist.

THE GREAT COMMISSION[1]

Professor FREDERICK L. ANDERSON
Newton Theological Institution

It is the second part of our task to investigate the baptismal clause, a less important, but most interesting study.

At first sight the facts are startling. This is the only command to baptize which is anywhere attributed to Jesus. The attentive reader of Matthew is surprised at this new idea of baptism introduced in the very last paragraph of the Gospel. Nothing in the previous pages has prepared him for it. The parallels or references to the Great Commission in Luke, Acts, and John contain no reference to baptism, and this makes it doubtful whether the baptismal clause ever had a place in Mark's lost ending or in Q. Not only does the command to baptize stand absolutely alone, but the Threefold Name shares its solitude. Elsewhere baptism is in the name of Jesus Christ. Reading carefully the history of Jesus' ministry after the early ministry in conjunction with John the Baptist in Judea, we do not find any reference to baptism as the duty of disciples. It seems as though it had entirely lapsed. Men and women are represented as becoming the disciples of the Lord only by repentance and faith. Even when Jesus sent out the Twelve and the Seventy with quite detailed instructions, he did not tell them to baptize anybody, nor did they report on their return that they had done so. It takes time for a modern Christian to take these facts in and to get their full force. The silence about baptism during Jesus' ministry is at least fatal to the central place which it occupies in the Roman Catholic and other sacramental systems. The very live question is whether it is not fatal to Christian baptism even as an entirely subordinate factor in Christianity. Just here we wish to call

[1] The first part of this article appeared in the last issue of Crozer Quarterly, January, 1926.

attention to the fact that the Lord's Prayer, though in both Luke and Matthew in quite different forms, is never afterward referred to in the New Testament, though the early "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" instructs Christians to repeat it three times a day. Does any one think that this proves the Lord's Prayer not the words of Jesus? Pentecost too is never mentioned or referred to after the second of Acts. This is not the whole case against the baptismal clause, however. Let us now take up these and other arguments in logical order and examine them.

In the first place Conybeare has pointed out that in 18 out of 21 places where Eusebius uses the Great Commission, he seems to have had a text, which read like this, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations *in my name,* teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you." This, it will be noticed, omits all reference to baptism and has "in my name" in place of the Threefold Name. These eighteen instances are all in the writings of Eusebius previous to the Nicene Council, the other three which contain the form familiar to us are in writings ascribed to Eusebius after the Council in his old age, writings which, a few scholars think, are wrongly reckoned as his.

On the other hand, the statement already made in this paper, that the Great Commission stands in the text of all manuscripts and translations, holds good of the baptismal clause also, which is given in the usual form in Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Justin, and the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." The very early spurious ending of Mark also in its reference to the Great Commission includes the baptismal clause. All these are of course long before the time of Eusebius.

It is impossible in a paper of this kind to go into the technicalities of such textual matters. Suffice it to say that after careful review of all the facts, it seems safe to conclude that if Eusebius did have a different text in some manuscript

which has since perished, it is quite improbable that that manuscript represented the original text of Matthew. In this I agree with Wilkinson, Chase, Stanton, Moffatt, McNeile, Plummer, Harnack, and Zahn against Conybeare, Allen, and Lake. The Eusebian quotations can therefore be set aside.

Again it is said that Jesus cannot have enjoined baptism, because he dealt in great spiritual principles and not in specific commands, and was entirely opposed to rites and ceremonies. Of course this is an *a-priori* argument, and it must be clearly seen that it applies to the continuance of the Lord's Supper as well as to baptism. That our Lord never indulged in specific commands is, however, a mistake. He certainly gave rather detailed instructions to the Twelve and the Seventy (Matt. 10 : 5-15; Luke 10 : 4-12, a Q passage) and these with reference to the missionary enterprise, and we believe that he directed the perpetual observance of the Lord's Supper. (Cf. also Matt. 18 : 18.)

We quite agree, however, that Jesus was opposed to mere rites and ceremonies. In the Lord's Supper, he did not establish a mere rite or ceremony, but, as he himself indicates, a symbolic ordinance, an emblematic feast, a double parable expressing the deepest spiritual truths of the Christian life. He doubtless looked in the same way on baptism. At least, his most Christlike followers did. It is not a rite, but a visible word, a preaching symbol, a moving picture of purification and regeneration, an acted gospel, proclaiming the fundamental verities of salvation. Our Lord never wrote a letter or a book to our knowledge, but he did give us two evangels, exactly suited to impress the common mind, baptism and the Lord's Supper. They are teaching symbols, not magic rites.

But what are we to do with the naked fact that here and here alone Jesus is said to command baptism? Baptism in the New Testament originated with John the Baptist, and the best scholarship connects it with Jewish proselyte baptism, which was an initiatory ordinance, and probably symbolized

not only purification, but the death to the old heathen life and the rising to a new life in Judaism. Jesus, it will be noted, fully approved John's baptism, not only submitting to it, but, according to the Fourth Gospel, working in union with John, and allowing his disciples to baptize (John 4 : 2). He held John in the highest esteem, said that he was the greatest born of women (Matt. 11 : 11 and parallel, Q), and in the last days of his life, our Lord declared that John's baptism was from heaven (Mark 11 : 30 and parallels). At least five of Jesus' apostles were John's disciples, and, of course, had received his baptism.

Beginning with Jesus' Galilean ministry, we find no mention of baptism, and it is probable, though not certain, that Jesus allowed it to lapse, possibly because he did not wish to bring his ministry into direct rivalry with John's (John 4 : 1-3). On the other hand, the fact that from the Day of Pentecost onward baptism was universally demanded of all converts, Jews as well as Gentiles, as an initiatory symbol, with no passage suggesting the opposite, goes to prove two things: (1) That Jesus must have given some such direction about baptism as is recorded in the Great Commission. This is admitted by Keim and reckoned quite possible by Johannes Weiss and Lietzmann, who, of course, would refer it to some time before Christ's death. (2) That all the apostles must themselves have been baptized, else they could not have demanded baptism of others. This looks a little as though baptism had not wholly lapsed during Jesus' Galilean ministry.

When we consider the unbroken testimony of the Acts and the Epistles that no one was considered a Christian unless he was baptized, and the further fact that Paul, the most spiritual of all the apostles, who had no patience with outward rites, not only made no objection to baptism, but was in perfect agreement with all the rest with reference to it, the impression that Jesus must have either commanded or sanctioned it can not be resisted.

Suppose that baptism had lapsed during Jesus' ministry, as seems probable though not certain, why is it thought impossible that he now revived it by his command? In the last week of his life, his mind reverted to John's baptism (Mark 11 : 30 and parallels) and he said that it was from heaven: now, after his resurrection, when all possible danger of rivalry to John's movement has passed away, when he sends the disciples out on a world mission, when he sees the need of organization which naturally would have an initiatory symbol, when he desires to separate his new religion from the doomed Judaism by a cleft as deep as that which separated the heathen proselyte to Judaism from his past, when he sees the necessity of impressing on the Gentile converts the ideas of purification and new birth, is there any reason which would compel us to deny the command to baptize to Jesus? Nay, the uniform and universal practise of the church from the very beginning demands something of this kind.

But it is further objected to the baptismal clause that it smacks of later sacramentarianism and externalism in asserting that men are made disciples by baptism and teaching. This tends to the conclusion that the clause is a later interpolation, possibly of the second century. The exact relation of these present participles, "baptizing" and "teaching," to the principal verb, "make disciples" cannot be positively determined from the view-point of grammar alone. A scholar's decision with reference to it will be largely influenced by the presuppositions which he brings with him.

If he is a sacramentalist, and especially if he has infant baptism in mind, he is very apt to translate "make disciples by baptizing and teaching," making the participles present participles of identical action and participles of means. But in the case of the discipling of Gentiles, infant baptism, unknown in New Testament times, is especially out of place. Nor could adult baptism in the case of heathen generally or easily precede their becoming disciples.

Broadus, with his Baptist outlook, thinks of the baptizing and teaching as in a general way simultaneous with the discipling, a sort of attendant circumstance, two incidents in a discipling which would then be looked on as a lifelong process. This is, of course, possible, but it is doubtful whether this view of making disciples can be found elsewhere in the New Testament.

My own view is that baptizing and teaching are present participles of subsequent action[2] (so Acts 17 : 13; 18 : 23; 19 : 9), a somewhat common construction. Then, as usually in the Acts and the Epistles, the discipling comes first and is followed by baptism and instruction. We must, however, never forget that in the earliest church no one was counted a Christian until he had been baptized, and this fact in a modified way might favor the first construction proposed.

But the strongest objection to the baptismal clause is the so-called Trinitarian Formula, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (A. V.). This has been looked upon as a proof-text for the doctrine of the Trinity, and since the spuriousness of the essential part of 1 John 5 : 7, 8 has been proved to the satisfaction of all scholars except the Pope, the only remaining proof-text for the Trinity. It has also been looked upon as a form of words, a formula, to be repeated at every baptism with the idea of magical efficacy hovering in the background.

Of course if our Gospel of Matthew was written before the close of the first century, as almost all scholars now hold, this Trinitarian formula at least must be a much later insertion, because the first century had not formulated any doctrine of the Trinity, which in its completed expression is a product of the fourth and fifth centuries, and indeed that primitive age knew nothing of formulas. This formula also stands alone in the New Testament. When any mention of a name is made, baptism elsewhere in the New Testament is always "in (or

[2] Cf. Burton's "Moods and Tenses," 119, Remark.

into) the name of Jesus Christ" or "the Lord Jesus" (Acts 2 : 38; 10 : 48; 8 : 16; 19 : 5).

Let us take this bull by the horns. This so-called Trinitarian formula is neither Trinitarian nor a formula. It is like the Frenchman's definition of a crab, "a red fish that walks backwards": which is an excellent definition with three exceptions: a crab is not a fish, it is not red, and it does not walk backwards.

First, it is not Trinitarian. By this we mean that it does not necessarily imply that later process of philosophical definition and analysis, which issued in the Nicene and Chalcedonian creeds. There is nothing in these words "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" which has not distinct parallels in the earlier and later epistles and which is not prepared for and adumbrated in the words of Matthew and of Jesus himself. Of course, it is universally admitted that the materials for some sort of a doctrine of the Trinity are to be found in the New Testament, but we are quick to concede that in our clause they appear in their barest and most precise form.

The epistles are full of verses and sentences which mention the Father or God, the Son or Jesus, and the Holy Spirit in intimate connection. The earliest is 2 Thessalonians 2 : 13, 14. It is followed by 1 Corinthians 12 : 4-6, 2 Corinthians 13 : 14, Ephesians 4 : 4-6, and 2 : 18, and 1 Peter 1 : 2. Others could easily be found. Most noteworthy is 1 Corinthians 12 : 4-6, "There are diversities of spiritual gifts, but the same Spirit, and diversities of ministries, and the same Lord (Jesus), and diversities of workings, but the same God (the Father), who works all things in all." The briefest is Ephesians 2 : 18, "Through him (Christ) we both have access in one Spirit unto the Father." The nearest in analogy to our clause is the benediction at the close of 2 Corinthians: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all" (2 Cor. 13 : 14).

But we find this collocation also in this very Gospel of Matthew and, pointedly enough, in the account of the baptism of Jesus himself. Here (Matt. 3 : 16, 17) it is said that, after his baptism, Jesus saw the Spirit of God descending upon him, and heard the divine voice, " This is my beloved Son in whom I (the Father) am well pleased." This links Father, Son, and Spirit with baptism.

As far as the words of Jesus are concerned, we do not need to prove in detail that he called God Father, and even *the* Father as in our clause. (For *the* Father, see Matt. 11 : 27—Q, and 24 : 36—Mark.) He calls himself the Son, a title implied in every use of " my Father," in Matthew 11 : 27 (Q); 21 : 37, 38 (Mark); 22 : 2; 24 : 36 (Mark); 26 : 63, 64 (Mark); 27 : 43 and other passages. He speaks of the Spirit in Matthew 10 : 20 (Mark); 12 : 28; 12 : 31, 32. Indeed in this latter passage Jesus mentions or implies all three names, " And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man (Jesus), it shall be forgiven him (by the Father), but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven him (by the Father), in this age or in the coming age." Again after his resurrection, he says, " Behold I (the Son) send the promise of my Father (i. e., the Spirit) upon you " (Luke 24 : 48).

The conception of " the name " was also a common one to Jesus; see the Lord's Prayer, " Hallowed be thy name," and many other instances, some of them referring to others doing acts in his own name (Matt. 7 : 22; 10 : 22, 41, 42, and many others).

All the elements of the clause are therefore proved to have been familiar to the evangelist, and so there is no demand for thinking this a later interpolation, and they are also proved to have been in the thought of Jesus, and therefore not foreign to his mind nor impossible upon his lips.

In the second place this phrase is not a formula, i. e., not a form of words to be repeated over the candidate at his

baptism, as though it had some almost magical efficacy. Rather these words express the deepest truth of spiritual Christianity.

To prove this rather startling proposition, we call attention to the fact that both the English and American Revisers translate without any alternative in the margin, "baptizing them *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

Now what is the name? The name stands for the person. My name represents me. "Hallowed be thy name" is a petition, not that the name of God be treated with reverence, that the letters and sound of the sacred name should be deemed holy, but that God himself should be universally revered. To come in my name, to speak or act in my name, means to come, speak, or act for me, as my representative. When we are bidden to pray in the name of Jesus, it does not mean that we are to repeat his name, but that we are to pray in his character and as his representatives, thinking his thoughts, purposing his purposes, and desiring the things which he desired.

Paul defines it for us in connection with baptism. In 1 Corinthians 1 : 13 and 15 he asks, "You were not baptized into the name of Paul, were you?" implying the answer, "No, but we were baptized into the name of Christ." But Paul uses interchangeably with this, Galatians 3 : 27, "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ," Romans 6 : 3, "As many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus," 1 Corinthians 10 : 2, "They all baptized themselves into Moses." It is interesting to learn that both Tertullian and Jerome also use interchangeably baptism into the name and into the person. And baptism into the person can mean only baptism into spiritual union with that person, union with his character, purpose, feeling, and experiences. So Paul says that those who are baptized into Christ are baptized into his death.

Now the very idea of baptism, immersion, gives added force to this view. To immerse into water, to immerse into Christ, to immerse into his death, all this is picturesque and

explains the immersion into union with the Father and the Son and the Spirit. In this connection we see that the water of baptism is a type of nothing less than God himself, who alone can cleanse, who alone can spiritually recreate and give new life. This is directly in line with Scripture. John the Baptist says, "I immerse you in water, he shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 3 : 11). "All ye who were immersed into Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. 3 : 27). As the candidate "is immersed in the water, so he is immersed into Christ. As the water wraps him round, so Christ wraps him round. Henceforth he is in Christ" (Chase. p. 505).[3] There is no difference, as some have contended, between baptism into (εἰς) the name of Jesus and baptism in (ἐν) the name of Jesus. The difference is merely in the figurative conception of the same act. Immersing in water refers to the water as surrounding the person immersed. He is in the water. Immersing into water refers to the entrance of the person into the water, from which he is later to emerge. So immersing in or immersing into the name or personality of Jesus, are practically equivalent; one pictures the entrance into union with the personality and the other the union itself.

This denial that the phrase bearing the Threefold Name is a formula entirely disposes of the argument against it drawn from the evident practise of the early church to baptize in the name of Jesus Christ. It was not a case of rival formulas, but simply the use of a simpler and a longer statement of a profound spiritual truth. We therefore find the writer of the early "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," using the longer and the shorter phrase interchangeably without any thought of contradiction or embarrassment. Even there the words had not hardened into a formula.

So both baptism and the Lord's Supper teach the same doctrine of union with Christ. This profound spiritual view of these words which takes us out of the realm of philosophical

[3] Cf. Ellicott in loc. and Hovey. So Boise and Alford.

theology on the one hand and out of the sphere of formalism and sacramentarianism on the other, is well set forth by Chase in his remarkable article in the *Journal for Theological Studies,* 1905, pp. 481-512. Tertullian and Jerome are discovered to be its earliest sponsors, Alford, Westcott, and Ellicott (on Gal. 3 : 27) had already pointed it out, and it has been adopted by Allen, the recent commentator on Matthew, and by the more recent Plummer and McNeile.

It is of great interest to Baptists, many of whom are giving up their contention, to read these words of the competent New Testament scholar, F. J. Chase, Vice Chancellor of the University of Cambridge and Bishop of Ely, "I submit that the passages of the New Testament justify the position that the word *Βαπτίζειν* should be translated rather than transliterated."

We are now in a position once more to ask the question whether the baptismal clause stands so absolutely alone as has been thought. Johannes Weiss and Lietzmann, both extreme radicals, are not prepared to deny, indeed are almost willing to concede that the universal custom of baptism in the early church goes back to a command of Jesus, though, as deniers of the resurrection, they cannot, of course conceive of a command given by the risen Lord.

The frequent references to Father, Son, and Spirit by all the early Christian writers must have had their source in the conversations and speech of Jesus, for we find nothing of the kind in Jewish literature. To be sure, in that literature God is often the Father of Israel as in the Old Testament, and the Spirit of God is a rather indefinite Old Testament conception. The Messiah too is sometimes spoken of as Son in the Old Testament and sometimes even in other Jewish literature of Jesus' time, but there is no such frequent mention of the three in such intimate connection, nor so high and definite conceptions of them either in the Old Testament or other Jewish literature. This is new and extremely difficult to believe of

fanatically monotheistic Jews like the early Jewish Christians unless they had been thus taught by Jesus.

We are now prepared to find possible hints of this baptismal clause in the Acts and the Epistles. Zahn maintains that we find one in 1 Corinthians 1 : 17, "For Christ sent me not to baptize [as he did the other apostles], but only to preach the gospel." Lietzmann almost is inclined to agree to this. Zahn also declares that "the circumcision of Christ," Paul's figurative description of baptism in Colossians 2 : 11, represents baptism as instituted by Christ, and refers to Matthew 21 : 25, "the baptism of John," and other passages. These are possible hints, but no more.

Other texts much more clearly show that Paul thought of baptism as baptism into the Holy Spirit. In Acts 19 : 2ff., he asks the twelve disciples of John if they had received the Holy Spirit and when they answered, "We have not so much as heard whether there be a Holy Spirit," Paul asks, "Into what then were ye immersed?" clearly showing that he expected believers to be immersed into the Holy Spirit; although Luke immediately describes it, without any contradiction, it seems to me, as baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 19: 5). In 1 Corinthians 6 : 11 we read, "But ye were washed [probably referring to baptism], ye were sanctified, ye were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God." This gives us two of the three divine names in a probable reference to baptism. In 1 Corinthians 12 : 13, we find, "For in one Spirit were you all baptized into one body." Immersion in the Spirit results in oneness of the spiritual body of Christ. Back of this idea of baptism in (or into) the Spirit stand the words of the Baptist, "I baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit," words caught up by Jesus, Acts 1 : 5, and by Peter in Acts 11 : 16, but these passages may also refer to the more recent Great Commission.

There are special reasons why Jesus in this connection

should have been moved to add the names of the Father and the Spirit to his own. He was sending his disciples out to convert idolaters and polytheists. The Father might be taken for granted by Jews, but would need to be put in the first place of emphasis among the Gentiles. Converts to Christianity must first be converted to monotheism, as Paul's speeches at Lystra and Athens abundantly prove. At this same time, if we are to trust Luke, and we do, our Lord's mind was full of the outpouring of the Spirit (Luke 24 : 49), the promise of the Father (Acts 1 : 5-8), the power from on high, whom the disciples were soon to receive, and whom John 14 to 16 promises with such confidence. It is significant that after Pentecost, the disciples think the gift of the Spirit came from the very hand of Christ himself (Acts 2 : 33 and John 15 : 26; 16 : 7; cf. Luke 24 : 49; Acts 1 : 5; 11 : 16).

Nothing could more clearly establish the fact that the thought of the Spirit was in the mind of Christ and his name frequently on his lips in those last days.

The final question arises whether the thought of personal union involved in the words "immersing into the name," was one of the ideas of Jesus. Of course, it is one of the great central pillars of Paul's teaching and of Christian experience. Any one who believes as we do that the teaching of Jesus, as recorded in John, has historical value, has, of course, no doubts on the point. John 14 to 17 are all-sufficient proof. But in modern investigation, it is necessary to ask whether the Synoptists also represent this as the teaching of our Lord. I think that they do.

Jesus' disciples are to follow him (Matt. 4 : 19; Mark 8 : 34; John 10 : 27). This means that they are to obey him (Matt. 7 : 24-27, Q), that they are to take the cross (Matt. 10 : 38; 16 : 24; Mark 8 : 34; Luke 9 : 23; 14 : 27—Mark and Q), to drink his cup and to be baptized with his baptism (Mark 10 : 38, 39; Matt. 20 : 22, 23). He identifies himself with them most closely. "He that receiveth you, receiveth

me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me" (Matt. 10 : 40; Luke 10 : 16). This is probably repeated or at least again reported in Mark 9 : 37; Matthew 18 : 5; Luke 9 : 48. And the spirit of it shines in those well-known words of Matthew 25 : 45, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these least (disciples), ye did it unto me." Identification of the Saviour and the disciple could not be made much closer. John's Vine and the Branches and his "I in you and you in me" are only another way of saying the same thing. Paul got his idea "in Christ" not only from experience, but from the thought of Jesus himself. Union with Christ is certainly one of the central deliverances of Christian experience.

Did Jesus, whose moral and religious insight is the marvel of the ages, fail to perceive it? Would any one have us believe that Paul and John were spiritually profounder than their Lord? But all such questions are rendered impertinent even from the critical side when we recall the symbolic eating of the body and the drinking of the blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, the emblem of the appropriation of the Master's spirit and life by the believer.

There is, then, no valid argument which makes it impossible that we have in the Great Commission the very words of Jesus. Still, when we reflect that these words were spoken by our Lord in Aramaic and were then after some years perhaps translated into Greek; when we find in them some of the stylistic peculiarities of Matthew; when we have long accustomed ourselves to the constant variations of the Lord's words found in parallel passages in Mark, Matthew, and Luke, due probably principally to the attrition of years of oral tradition, truth will not allow us to say that the Great Commission *surely* gives us Jesus' *very* words; but our whole paper has proved that in these verses as they stand on the page of our Bibles, we have not only the mind of the Master and the very spirit of Christianity, but for substance the Great Commission of our Lord.

EDUCATED YOUNG PEOPLE—THE PASTOR'S PROBLEM

WILLIAM COLEMAN BITTING, D. D.,
St. Louis, Missouri

PREVALENT emphasis on education, and interest in it by churches, raises a problem that should be squarely met. For it only one solution is possible.

Church-members put their hands in their pockets to pay their taxes. Part of this money goes to support state schemes of education from kindergartens to universities. A second gift of money is made to found and endow denominational schools. A third and large invasion of the purse is made when Christian parents send their sons and daughters to these schools. The problem arises with this question, "Shall these church-members put their hands in their pockets a fourth time to pay the salary of an uneducated or ill-prepared pastor who denounces as godless these schools, which the same givers have founded and patronized; who compels the very flower of the church, its educated sons and daughters, either to stay away from church to avoid hearing their brains affronted in the name of God; or, if they attend services from filial considerations, to stifle their intellectual and moral self-respect?" Shall the churches choose pastors who have enjoyed modern educational privileges, who know what young people are learning, and thus can prevent intellectual or moral shock when the inevitable test of previous religious training comes in the processes of modern education? If that religious training be true, it will stand. If false, it will vanish.

Furthermore, does the church appreciate its responsibility for the half-million young men and women who are now in colleges and universities? The writer has ministered in about thirty institutions of learning for longer or shorter residential periods. The problems that these young people meet, the ex-

pressions of mental and spiritual pains inevitable in the transitions they were making, because of previous faulty religious training, are yet keenly vivid to him. To try to help them in the readjustment which was forced upon them, was a great joy. Many pastors have had this experience, some to a much larger extent. When the spiritual significance of an intellectual unfolding, and of the larger, deeper views of religious truth have come to a student, how often he has asked, "What place will there be for me in my home church when I return?" The memory of experiences, and the consciousness of the inadequacy of previous religious training and teaching to stand the test of educational developments, make this question one of supreme moment. Sometimes students have declared that their only escape from this prospective embarrassment would be to attend some other church than that from which they came. They hoped for pastoral leadership offered by some minister of another denomination, adequately prepared and in thorough sympathy with our modern colleges and universities. Sometimes they have become indifferent to religion itself, have "thrown out the baby when they emptied the bath."

The problem thus stated involves at least two elements. First, that of training by the pastor of the local church, who shall give his congregation intelligent knowledge of God, of Jesus Christ, of the Holy Scriptures, and of human relations. This real knowledge will endure throughout the educational career and subsequent life. There is also the vast problem, not yet thoroughly appreciated by the Christian church, of an adequate ministry to students in colleges and universities. They should be helped while in these institutions to appreciate the spiritual and religious significance of their studies and to relate this significance to their own lives. Life is a unity. We cannot expect educated people to have partitions in their brains or in their moral natures; to keep intellectual matters on one side thereof and religious matters on the other. In his "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" Henry Drummond

states that he tried such a cranial septum to house his science on one side and his religion on the other, but that a process of osmosis followed. His science and his religion mingled with each other. Thus was formed the idea of his book. Whatever be one's opinion of that work, there can be no doubt that today none thinks of trying to establish such a septum anywhere. It is a tragedy that with many there arises the dilemma of "either," "or." What commends itself as reality in college and university must be accepted. If such reality demands the giving up of some religious ideas that were instilled before college life began, they must go. Some preachers and pastors did not appreciate the problem we are discussing, or, if they did more or less dimly realize it, they avoided any effort to solve it. Those who feel this terrible alternative, may reject such religious ideas as they have had and mistakenly come to think that religion is of no value. Or, they may follow leaders, teachers, and pastors who satisfy their heart hungers and bring them to know that religious realities are as deep and pervasive as those they have yielded to in their studies. Religion with them must be, not a fraction of life, not a separate compartment of being, but an energy that pervades the whole being, as real as mathematics or anything else they live on and live by, and must integrate itself with their entire intellectual, practical, and social lives.

It goes without the saying that preachers and pastors should appreciate this problem that grows out of our devotion to both religion and education. It should be self-evident that the work of the church should not be limited to numerical building up of local groups, and their union for missionary, philanthropic, and educational purposes in the establishment and maintenance of organization and institutions to advance these purposes. When young men or women shall have left the local church for the new environment of college or university, the church should go with them and help in the inevitable and difficult process of readjustment which is sure to

follow. The other alternative is to let these young people drift away from local churches, and from interest in the great moral ideals for which local churches supposedly stand. The writer's experience in this ministry in colleges and universities, the careful questioning of hundreds of students, efforts to discover the causes for this too often growing indifference to the churches, have not revealed that teachers in classrooms or in lectures have assaulted religion itself. I have yet to hear such attacks. There may have been utterances concerning matters with which the professor was properly dealing that compelled the students to examine their so-called religious convictions. Many times it has been discovered that ill-founded, unintelligent conceptions of the student, which should never have been given to him, which he never should have been allowed to obtain, have been abandoned. This was not because of assault upon these by the teacher, but because the sincere student who tried to "see life whole" had been making honest effort to have his religious ideals and convictions as real to him as are matters of geology and astronomy and history, or the laboratory.

The church will need these educated, gifted people, not only in its local work, but in the larger spheres of Christian influence. This constantly increasing number of educated persons is to be more and more dominant in the generation to which they belong. Surely wisdom demands that in their training under the pastor of the local church before college, and in the care of the church for them while they are in college, they shall not be loaded with ideas and opinions which at college come to their day of judgment and which must inevitably be cast aside. They can be trained to convictions that will stand the test of reality, that will not be adversely affected, but enhanced by an educational career; convictions that will be deepened by all learning, and all knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, and man, and of human relations, whether from history, or science, or literature, or the priceless Scriptures.

The practical question is one for a pastor and also for churches in relation to college students. Untrained, uneducated pastors should not oppose the equipment which others have had. There is room for all. Each is to use his own gift, none is to decry the gifts of others. The very first qualification for entrance into the kingdom of God and the condition of remaining in it, is that one shall "become as a little child." The open soul is primary. Very often we forget that repentance or a "change of mind" is necessary for many to become as a little child. We must empty ourselves of prejudices, conceits, preconceptions, of even what we have supposed to be our "conscientious convictions" if facts arise which challenge and compel a change of all these. This is hard to do, harder for the ignorant than for the intelligent. A clogged, hermetically sealed, petrified spirit is proof against all the inflow of divine realities. A cataclysm may burst it open. So far as the normal processes of nature are concerned, it is true, as Phillips Brooks wrote in his great hymn,

> How silently, how silently
> The wondrous gift is given!
> So God imparts to human hearts
> The blessings of his heaven.

The pastor, for the sake of the religious lives of the young who are attending secondary schools and have their college lives before them, should be a teaching pastor. He should so work in his pulpit, and in the equipment of his church school, by care for the kind of teachers who render this beautiful service, and in every other way possible, that nothing comes into the minds and hearts of the young that will have to be thrown out later. The process of unlearning is even more painful than the process of learning. There is the shock beside. He should never be guilty of the monstrous sin of irreverently or mechanically "handling the word of God deceitfully." His first questions should be: "What did the writer of these words mean?

What did he intend those who originally heard or read them to understand?" The answers to these questions will kill numberless sermons, but they will save an equally numberless multitude of souls from receiving false impressions. If a minister cannot be as honest with the Bible as he wants his correspondent to be with the letter he writes, he ought not to try to preach. In one of my pastorates, while teaching a Bible class, using the Bible Union Version of the New Testament made by Doctors Broadus, Weston, and Hovey, a woman, who prided herself upon her intelligence, objected to the use of any Bible other than the Authorized version. She added that she did not need to read the Bible, that the spirit of God told her directly what was the truth and how she ought to live. Then, as if to verify her ignorance which masqueraded under such pretentious profession of piety, she added, "If *Saint* James Version was good enough for the *apostle Paul,* it ought to be good enough for you." I leave the reader to study the last sentence.

To elaborate the simple advice of the preceding paragraph would require a volume. There is space only to add that in every community there are intelligent people. These are needed by the church and they need the church. We often talk about the "appeal" of the church to intelligent people. It can be made if preachers themselves be intelligent. If, in the methods of handling the Bible and subjects proper for pulpit discussion, preachers show intelligence, and do not enter fields they are not prepared to enter, intelligent people will soon find it out, and their inborn religious natures will respond.

A FIRST-CENTURY SAINT IN THE EIGHTEENTH

Rev. OWEN PHILIPS EACHES, D. D.,
Haddonfield, N. J.

In his lifetime he filled a very inconspicuous place, but after his death he began to live in a larger way. His body lies buried at Northampton, Mass., but his soul goes marching on. Some men have the faculty of starting other lives; David Brainerd was a man of this kind. Two hundred years after his death, his life stimulates others. He did not live long. Between his birth in 1718 and his death in 1747 only twenty-nine years intervened. He wrote no books, left nothing that can be classed as literature, established no schools, started no religious movements; his life was not eccentric like Edward Irving; he lived in a hut among the Indians. What we know of him is found in his diary, a large part of which by his request on his death-bed was burned. In this diary we find the man revealed in his innermost nature, his ideals of life, his absorption in his desire for holiness, his practise of piety. It was said of Gray that he went down to immortality with a little book under his arm, his Elegy in a Country Churchyard. In like manner Brainerd has won the admiration of men by his unaffected piety, his sacrifice for others in the lowest stratum of life.

Two New England men, by their labors among the American Indians, have been enrolled in the lists of those whom we call our saints. The first of those, John Eliot (1604-1690) was a great-minded man, a Cambridge graduate who gave many years of his life to Christian work among the Indians of Massachusetts. They wrote of him, " He was one of the most extraordinary men of any country." Eliot's life looked at in an outward way, seems like a vast failure. The people among whom he lived have disappeared from the earth, the Bible which he translated for them remains, but not a person in the

world can read it. But Eliot's life touched David Brainerd's, and he too gave himself to the Indian. Both of these looked at today in the light of statistics would be classed failures, but they have enriched the last two centuries by presenting the highest ideals of Christian living. Brainerd was born at Haddam, Conn., April 20, 1718, of good parentage. At fourteen he was left an orphan. Very early he began to think of his soul life. He writes of this period:

> I was from my youth sober and inclined to melancholy; but do not remember anything of connection of sin worthy of remark till I was seven or eight years of age. I was without much concern till I was above thirteen years of age.

In 1738 he went to live with Rev. Mr. Fiske, the Haddam pastor. His natural boyhood piety received a wrong trend on the advice of his pastor—" that he abstain entirely from young company and associate himself with grave elderly people—which counsel I followed." Whether as a boy he had read Bunyan's Pilgrim Progress, I do not know, but he had a Bunyan-like experience. He had his Slough of Despond, his Doubting Castle, his Conflict with Apollyon, his residence in the town of Morality. Like Bunyan, he envied the cattle that could not be guilty in God's sight, he feared that hell would open in the night and swallow him. He spoke of the discovery of his vile and wicked heart as something dreadful. He finally found the Wicket Gate. Under date of October 18, 1740, he writes:

> In my morning devotions my soul was exceedingly melted and bitterly mourned over my great sinfulness and vileness. I never before had felt so pungent and deep a sense of the odious nature of sin as at this time; my soul was then unusually carried forth in love to God and had a lively sense of God's love to me. And this love and hope at that time cast out fear.

Under date of April 20, 1742, he writes:

> This day I am twenty-four years of age. This has been a sweet and happy day to me, blessed be God! I think my soul was never so drawn

out in intercession for others as it has been this night. I hardly ever so longed to live for God and to be altogether devoted to him. I wanted to wear out my life in his service and for his glory.

In November, 1742, there came the proffer of work among the Indians near Albany. He writes: "So I retired and prayed; and indeed it was a sweet time with me." He worked under the auspices of the Society in Scotland for propagating Christian knowledge. Beginning at Albany, he worked subsequently at Easton, Pennsylvania, and Cranbury, New Jersey. He labored under great disadvantages. He could talk to the Indians only through an interpreter. There was no written language. They were widely scattered so that it was difficult to have a settled congregation. But he lived among them in a brotherly way, sharing in their daily life. In 2 Corinthians 11 : 23-31 Paul gives an insight into his life, ground between the cog-wheels of privations and persecutions. Brainerd lived, passed months in a similar Paul-like simplicity. His diary has these words:

My circumstances are such that I have no comfort of any kind but what I have in God. I live in the most lonesome wilderness; have but one single person to converse with that can speak English. I have no fellow Christian to whom I may unbosom myself or lay open my spiritual sorrows; with whom I may take sweet counsel in conversation about heavenly things and join in social prayer. I live poorly with regard to the comforts of life; most of my diet consists of boiled corn and hasty pudding. I lodge on a bundle of straw, my labor is hard and extremely difficult, and I have little appearance of success to comfort me.

But alongside of this he wrote:

I enjoyed some sweetness in prayer; my soul rose so far above the deep waters that I dared to rejoice in God. I saw that there was sufficient matter of consolation in the blessed God.

With no helpers but a winning personality, prayer, the Holy Spirit, and at times a drunken interpreter, yet with open-mindedness on the part of the Indians, spiritual awakenings took place. His meetings were occasions of weeping, confes-

sion of sin, inquiries after God. His discourses to his untutored audiences were on the great New Testament themes, human sinfulness, regeneration, salvation through Christ, the need of a holy character. The converted Indians developed a prayerful, worshipful, intelligent Christian life, and a church organization with the Lord's Supper regularly observed. With a practical good judgment, Brainerd planned for the founding of a well-ordered Christian community, as well as establishing a Christian church. He gathered the Indians into a settlement near the church, urged his new Christians to plant wheat, erect fences, cultivate industry, economy, integrity. His church-membership numbered over thirty, with a congregation at times of one hundred and fifty. He traveled hundreds of miles to visit other Indian tribes, exposed to storms. He was offered positions of ease and prominence, but having put his hand on the plow-handle, he kept on to the end of the furrow. When Judson declined a Boston pastorate for labor among the heathen, people at large said he had thrown away his life and his opportunity. He saved his life by losing it. Brainerd's incessant labors, his intense soul proved too much for his body—his health gave way, and he turned his face toward New England to regain strength for further service.

A marked characteristic of Brainerd was his prayerfulness. A score of times in his diary is found the sentence, "Spent this day in fasting and prayer," "was enabled in secret prayer to raise my soul to God, it was indeed a blessed season." It is doubtful whether in any biography of the past century the prayer element has been so much an integral part of the life. Prayer, piety, spiritual power abounded in his life. He lived in intense realization of sin, not in the abstract but a sense of his own sin. An ordinary Christian cannot understand his expressions of humility and his longing for complete holiness. Only a great Christian like Paul can make honest use of such expressions as are found in Romans 9 : 1; 10 : 1, and 1 Timothy 1 : 15. He delighted in God, in thinking of

him, in worship of him, in service for him, in the effort to be like him. Xavier's intensity in his Christian life found expression in the words "More souls, more souls!" Brainerd's spiritual life found expression in "O for more conformity to the character of God. More fellowship with him, more service for him!"

His life and work have, from the first, been a mold in which other lives have been shaped. He had the respectful reverence of the largest-minded man in the country, Jonathan Edwards, in whose home he died. Edwards gives thanks to God for the merciful providence that made his house Brainerd's home for several months. He says, he saw his dying behavior, heard his dying speeches, received his dying counsels, had the benefit of his dying prayers. To the question what can be done to revive the work of God in the world, John Wesley made answer, "Let every preacher read carefully the life of David Brainerd." William Carey and Henry Martyn felt the impress of Brainerd's consecrated and utterly dedicated life. To his journal they attributed much of their early missionary impulse. At a great remove from the above-mentioned men is the tribute of Frederick W. Robertson, of Brighton, England. At one period of his life he read daily the life of Brainerd. His testimony is in these words:

> I have been reading lately Brainerd's life which to my taste stands alone as a specimen of biography. To believe, to suffer, and to love was his motto, like that of the early Christians. Brainerd did spend himself in his Master's service, and his was self-denial that there was none to witness or admire.

It is a great tribute to a man's worth to have a man of Robertson's mold to admire him. Dr. A. J. Gordon, of Boston, kept an old volume of Brainerd's life on his study table. He said that he never received such spiritual help from any other human being as from this life so simple and so Christly. Almost every material thing connected with Brainerd has passed, except Brainerd Lake, and the place of his residence,

Brainerd Field. One sentence of the Indian language is found in his diary—*Guttum-mau kalummeh wechaaumeh Kmelch Nolah.* Brainerd's Indian tribes have disappeared. All that remains of Brainerd physically is a handful of dust, but his life, as we look at it today, was a great success.

It is altogether assured that the Christian who may get the secret of Brainerd's saintship and spiritual intrepidity will not have the height and depth of his emotional experiences. President Edwards notices the presence of a natural tinge of melancholy as affecting his spiritual experiences. If he did not always dwell in an assured hope on the mountaintop of fellowship with God, he was prone to feel that this was evidence of God's utter desertion from his life. Edwards regards this as an imperfection of his Christian experience. As we read of his long struggles for the assurance of peace in the heart we instinctively feel that a wise counselor like A. J. Gordon or D. L. Moody would have shown him that he need not dwell so long at Mt. Sinai on his way to the Cross. A strong Calvinistic theology from which the most evangelical churches of this century have largely departed and the expectation by the church that a certain type of experience was fitting if not essential, will account for Bunyan-like experiences. Taken all in all the study of Brainerd's life reveals a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, a life that was a burning and a shining light, delighting to serve Christ by serving men. "How far that little candle throws its beams." John Masefield wrote these following lines concerning David Livingstone. They may with equal appropriateness be applied to David Brainerd:

Forth to the fight he fared,
High things and great he dared,
He thought of all men but himself,
Himself he never spared.
He greatly loved—
He greatly lived—
And died right mightily!

INVOLUTION A NEEDED WORD IN RELIGION

The Reverend H. F. HUSE
Dover-Foxcroft, Maine

One of the outstanding features of modern science is the vocabulary of new words it has created. Every fresh discovery, every new invention of this wonder age of ours creates a new set of words to express and to help us to understand that new thing whatever it may be, automobile, aeroplane, radio, the newly discovered universe within the atom, or the island universes that we are now told throng the depths of the infinite spaces. Likewise new words current in psychology and philosophy are evidence of new frontiers in the search for truth.

Most of us, especially if we are preachers, can afford but one unabridged dictionary in a lifetime. Such, however, is the increase of scientific knowledge that the dictionary of ten or twenty years ago is a back number as far as containing the words one needs to know if he keeps up with these swift times.

Among the new words that science has given to us perhaps none is greater than the word " evolution " which undertakes to embody the principle in the development of the universe from what it was to what it is, and from what it now is to what it will be. What confusions have prevailed and continue to prevail in connection with this word! By it one man means one thing and another man means another thing. Until there can be the Socratic definition of terms confusion must continue, and along with confusion, continued controversy to disturb the peace of mind of many people.

At the time of the Dayton-Scopes-Bryan-Darrow episode the editor of a town newspaper in my State tried to sound out the local preachers upon the subject of evolution. One or two of the preachers were evidently embarrassed lest in

their answer they might be misunderstood, or be misinterpreted, and seem to commit themselves to something that would appear a denial of the Bible and Christianity. One of the preachers came back upon the editor and said to him, "Tell me what you mean by evolution, and I will tell you whether or not I believe it?"

There are many definitions of evolution. Perhaps the most general and commonly accepted definition is that which makes evolution the "creational processes" whereby things that are have come to be. The man who thinks of these processes wholly independent of God and without any belief that God, transcendent as well as immanent, has anything to do with them, is the man who proclaims himself by so doing a materialist, and his evolution is atheistic evolution—and such evolutionists I judge there are.

When in 1896 Professor E. D. Cope published his "Primary Factors of Organic Evolution" it has seemed to me that he created a definition of evolution which was calculated to eliminate God from the universe and its developing processes. He said:

> The doctrine of evolution may be defined as the teaching which holds that creation has been and is accomplished by the agency of the energies which are intrinsic in the evolving matter, and without the interference of agencies which are external to it. It holds this to be true of the combinations and forms of inorganic nature, and those of organic nature as well. Whether the intrinsic energies which accomplish evolution be forms of radiant or other energy only, acting inversely as the square of the distance, and without consciousness, or whether they be energies whose direction is affected by the presence of consciousness, the energy is a property of the physical basis of tridimensional matter, and is not outside of it, according to the doctrine we are about to consider.

This would seem to be a mechanistic, materialistic view of the universe, clear and definite, and for the religionist has little comfort for his faith and view of things. There seems about as much chance for God to have anything to do with

these processes as for sunlight to get into the deepest caverns of earth.

Science deals with a limited realm of experience. Science takes us back to that primordial stuff and primeval chaos that the inspired religious philosophy of Genesis describes—"The earth was void and without form, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." But religion takes us back to that which explains all things and back of which thought cannot go—"In the beginning God." Here is where Faith takes its stand. Back of this, thought cannot go. We may express our faith in the First Great Cause, but finite mind cannot comprehend the infinite. We know but in part.

Before a man erects a building there is first the thought of that building in his mind, and the purpose for which he wishes the building. Action in the matter depends upon the purpose to which the building is to be put—be it a home, a business block, or a temple in which to worship the God in whom he believes. We are not, as religionists, materialists or realists, but idealists. Before the thing created there is the idea of that thing in the mind of the creator—and supremely in the mind of God the Creator and Lord of all. Before the actuality of the universe there has been and continues the ideality of the universe—God himself back of these processes whereby the things that are have come to be.

Speaking in the name of science Edwin Grant Conklin, in a recent issue of *Scribner's,* said:

> The universe is one of ends as well as means, of teleology as well as mechanism. Chance is incredible. Darwin, Huxley, Asa Gray, Weismann—all maintain reasonable evidence of some governance and plan in nature. This is fundamental to all religious faith. If there be no purpose in evolution or in man, then indeed there is no God and no good.

Evolution, therefore, the word that science has given us and that deals strictly with the limited realm of experience which science includes, is not a sufficient word for religion and the man of Christian Faith. Evolution means literally "un-

folding." Evolution which science describes is the unfolding process in which in the course of time the simple becomes the complex, and the lower becomes the higher. But before there is the unfolding process there must be and is the infolding process. Therefore before the evolution which science describes there is the "involution" which religion affirms, and that, according to our religious faith and conviction, accounts for and explains not only evolution but the universe itself.

Is not then "involution" the word that religion needs to appropriate, to clear up the confusion and help settle the controversy? Let the scientist keep the word he has created. It is his. It belongs to him and the limited realm of knowledge with which science deals. Science deals with the material world. Religion deals with the spiritual realm which explains the material world, for if anything is true it is that the world that is visible has its existence and reality because it is a part of the world invisible. The things seen are temporal. The things unseen are eternal.

Science goes back to Genesis 1 : 2a. Religion goes back to Genesis 1 : 1 and 1 : 2b—"and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the deep." Science as the late Dr. Peter T. Forsyth said, "takes us back to the world. Religion takes us back to the Word." "In the beginning God." "In the beginning was the Word." Yes, and the inspired author of the Fourth Gospel brings us direct from the primeval chaos to the cradle in Bethlehem, and the incarnate Son of God who 1900 years ago walked this earth, concerning whom we believe what was said by the fisherman of Galilee, "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

Let science keep its word "evolution." But let us adopt and use to set forth our conviction and our faith "involution" that when we use it we may bear witness to our conviction that the glory which shines out of the burning yet unconsumed

bush is the glory of the transcendent and immanent God, who is in all and over all, even the glory of Jesus Christ for whom are all things, and in whom all things consist—are held together; "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Whatever the processes are whereby the universe is as it is, God initiated these processes and is back of them, and in them reveals his glory and purpose, his beneficent action in behalf of his creatures and his children.

What the "involution" is for which we plead is that which Dr. Samuel Harris expounded twenty-five, and more, years ago when he taught theological students at both Bangor and Yale.

> The universe in its continuous evolution is the continuous revelation of God. The doctrine of evolution itself requires the recognition of God as the Absolute Spirit transcending the universe, and presents new and decisive evidence that he is immanently active in it. Skepticism cannot be met effectively by minimizing the supernatural, apologetically trying to show that there must be at least a little of it in the universe, but only by maintaining the truth that it is the fundamental reality of the universe. The universe as a whole and in all its parts is dependent on God for its existence, its powers, its laws, order, evolution, and ultimate design.
>
> Even the coming of God in Christ is not contrary to the fundamental constitution and laws of the universe, but rather the consummation of the continuous action of God immanent in the universe, and ever coming nearer and nearer to man in the course of human history, revealing himself to men, seeking them in infinite love to bring them back to union and communion with himself, and continuing the consummate revelation through all ages in the Holy Spirit, "taking of the things of Christ and making them known unto us."

One wonders at the antiquity of man upon the earth, be it 6,000 years or 500,000 years. But back of the antiquity of man is the question of his origin. Back of the origin of man upon the earth is the question of the origin of the earth itself. Back of the earth is the question of the solar system of which this earth is such an insignificant planet. Back of the question

of the solar system of which our earth is such an insignificant part is the question of the origin of the myriads upon myriads of solar systems, island universes, nebulæ, comets, that make up this wonderful universe of which you and I at this very moment are a part and have our conscious existence.

The great, the sublime and divine answer to these questions is that which is given us in the first verse of the first chapter of the first book in the Bible, " In the beginning God." Back of this man cannot think. Back of this thought cannot go.

No gateway to ancient city or ancient temple was ever more imposing, grand, and beautiful than the majestic, awe-inspiring utterance which introduces us and leads us into the progressive revelation of God which is ours in the sacred Scriptures. Science explains the physical universe. Religion explains the spiritual universe and the relationship of each to the other. Dr. Alvah Hovey, the venerable teacher of my seminary days was wont to say:

> The sacred Scriptures rightly interpreted from beginning to end as a progressive revelation of God to man, and man to himself, and spiritual life to all who will accept it, will lead to truth without error, and justify that revelation as bringing to the people of each particular age the religious truth most needed by them, in the best available form for reaching the heart and purifying the life.

The Bible thus rightly interpreted so functions in the interest of religion.

The great utterance of modern science is " evolution." Just as God is back of " gravitation " and the law that reigns supreme in the realm of space, so God is back of " evolution," the law that the same science tells us reigns supreme in the realm of time. Before " gravitation " and " evolution," however, and explaining them both, is God transcendent and God immanent, God the Creator and Lord of All.

Religion needs a word of its own to express this relationship. Is there a better word to serve this need than " involu-

tion," and to express at the same time our religious faith and conviction?

The shining, guiding star of Protestant Christianity is "The Truth." If we are to find it and enjoy its freedom we must have freedom in its search.

However, let it be said in closing that the first task of Christianity is not "a problem to be solved be it evolution or what not, but a gift, a glorious gift to be received." It is as true today as when the Gospel writer first declared it, "to as many as received him, to them gave he the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name, which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

THE ATTITUDE OF JESUS TOWARD THE MOSAIC LAW, AND THE EATING OF BLOOD

W. W. KEEN, M. D., LL. D.

Emeritus Professor of Surgery, Jefferson Medical College;
Doctor, Honoris Causa, of the University of Paris

One cannot wonder that Jesus raised up enemies among all classes of the Jews. They held tenaciously to the letter of the law and the traditions of the Elders. He was an iconoclast. He repudiated their traditions, would none of their mint, anise, and cummin, but emphasized the weightier matters of the law. To a large extent he swept aside the outward forms and magnified the inward spirit. I presume that the extreme fundamentalists of his day scornfully called him a modernist, and even a heretic.

Again and again he quoted the Mosaic law, and then thundered forth, "But *I* say unto you." He spoke "as one having authority."

His teaching as to the law of compensation, exacting an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, on divorce, on fasting, and on the proper attitude toward one's enemies, was revolutionary.

So, too, of the observances of the Sabbath. He went at once to the marrow of the subject—"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." He repeatedly emphasized this new doctrine by healing on the Sabbath day, thus proclaiming that it *was* "lawful to do good on the Sabbath."

The most peculiar Jewish custom was that as to eating meat. The eating of the blood with the meat was most strenuously prohibited, as numerous passages from the Mosaic law show:

> But the flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat (Gen. 9 : 4).

It shall be a perpetual statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, that ye eat neither fat nor blood (Lev. 3 : 17).

Moreover ye shall eat no manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of beast. . . . Whatsoever soul it be that eateth any manner of blood, even that soul shall be cut off from his people (Lev. 7 : 26, 27).

And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul. Therefore, I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood, neither shall any stranger that sojourneth among you eat blood. . . . For it is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof: therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh: for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it shall be cut off (Lev. 17 : 10-12, 14).

Ye shall not eat any thing with the blood (Lev. 19 : 26).

Only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the life; and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh. Thou shalt not eat it; thou shalt pour it upon the earth as water. Thou shalt not eat it; that it may go well with thee, and with thy children after thee . . . And thou shalt offer thy burnt-offerings, the flesh and the blood, upon the altar of the Lord thy God: and the blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out upon the altar of the Lord thy God, and thou shalt eat the flesh (Deut. 12:23-25, 27).

Only thou shalt not eat the blood thereof; thou shalt pour it upon the ground as water (Deut. 15 : 23).

Today, "Kosher" meat, prepared after the Mosaic formula, is the chief outward manifestation of Jewish, as distinguished from non-Jewish, social customs.

The word "kosher" means "clean" or "fit." It applies not only to food but also to vessels for food.

Thus the vessels used at the Passover are "kosher," as are always new vessels bought from Gentiles after they have been washed in a ritual bath.

But "kosher" most often is applied to meats.

The butcher must be a devout Jew and of high moral character, and be duly licensed by the chief rabbi. The slaughtering—the object of which is to insure the complete bleeding of the body, the Jews being forbidden to eat blood—is done by severing the windpipe with a long and razor-sharp knife by one continuous stroke backwards and forwards. No unnecessary force is permitted, and no stoppage must occur during the operation. The knife is then carefully examined, and if there be the slightest flaw in its blade the meat cannot be eaten, as the cut would not have been clean, the uneven blade causing a thrill to pass through the beast and thus driving the blood again through the arteries. After this every portion of the animal is thoroughly examined, for if there is any organic disease, the devout Jew cannot taste the meat. (*Encyclopedia Britannica,* 11th Ed.)

Let us read from the three synoptic Gospels, and actual descriptions, of the Last Supper, in the light of these Jewish customs:

And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom (Matt. 26:26-29).

And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many (Mark 14 : 22-24).

And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood which is shed for you (Luke 22 : 19, 20).

Presumably, Jesus ate only "kosher" meat all his life, but at the Last Supper, he utterly discarded the Mosaic Law and taught a new doctrine, not, of course, to be understood and accepted literally, but symbolically.

To accept it literally would be an absurdity, for we *know*

that physically the bread and the wine are *not* altered. Luther, himself, however, was such a literalist, that he could not break away from the actual words of the Scripture, *Hoc est corpus meum* and *Hic est enim sanguis meus.*

It is a striking and a curious fact that the apostles at the Last Supper did not seem to have recoiled in the least from eating this bread, declared by Jesus, himself, to be his own "body," and the wine, to be his own "blood." So far as the record shows, they ate the bread and drank the wine without any questioning.

The reason for this seems to me to lie probably in the fact that Jesus undoubtedly again and again taught this truth to them, privately, and also to many others publicly. Repeatedly he explained his sayings and his parables to his disciples privately.

When, after feeding the 5,000, multitudes of people sought him out, seeking for a sign, such as was the manna in the wilderness, which they called "bread from heaven," Jesus openly taught the new doctrine. He replied that "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, by my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven, for the *bread of God* [note this expression] is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth his life unto the world."

Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. . . . The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven. . . . Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat

the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever (John 6 : 32-35, 41, 42, 47-58).

The deep-seated abhorrence of the Jews against the eating of blood, as Doctor Pollard has suggested to me, is brought out with peculiar emphasis in the so-called "Council at Jerusalem" (Acts 15) where even so marked a liberal as Paul was willing to make concessions to the Jewish religious convictions in this matter by agreeing to instruct the Gentile Christians that they refrain from "things strangled [i. e., from which the blood was *not* drained away] and from blood," clearly a fraternal concession to Jewish prejudice. Is it therefore possible to suppose that the early Jewish Christians could have for one moment understood that Jesus meant that in the elements of the Supper his own blood was actually being drunk? What a furor such an announcement would have created among his followers, who at first were all Jews.

There he was among them, intact, in his own person. It would seem to be impossible for them to believe that really and physically that bread and that wine were his actual flesh and blood.

Jesus constantly dealt in metaphor and parable. As a friend points out to me, he said, "I am the Good Shepherd" and "I am the true Vine." In John 6, he repeatedly refers to himself as the "bread from heaven" and when the people ask, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" he reiterates they must eat his flesh and drink his blood else they would "have no life in them," but he also interprets this hard saying by adding more than once, that they must "come unto him" and "believe in him"; then they will "have Everlasting Life,"

Christians accept the symbolical use of the words "the good Shepherd" and "the true Vine"; why not accept the same interpretation of the "eating his flesh" and "drinking his blood."

Thus did Jesus nullify the stern injunctions of the Old Testament and show us the way of enlightened interpretation of the Bible.

Today the religious liberty we gained four centuries ago is seriously threatened—most seriously threatened. The superstitions of the Church of Rome and its domination over the minds and bodies, the beliefs and the whole life of men, are reasserting themselves. The doctrine of transubstantiation, for example, is lifting its head even in Protestant churches. Not only is it spreading among the Anglo-Catholics in Great Britain, but is beginning to take root here, especially among the High Church Episcopalians.

Still worse, the so-called "Reservation of the Sacrament" is winning its way. This practise, as I understand it, is as follows: The bread and wine not consumed at the communion service, being esteemed actually the body and blood of Jesus, is divine, and is therefore placed in a consecrated place, and is actually adored.

We shall soon need a new Reformation and another Martin Luther.

A FIFTEENTH CENTURY MARTYR

The Reverend JOHN CROSBY, PH. D.
Glen-Campbell, Pa.

THE following notes of an early martyr to the cause of religious freedom were made some years ago during a vacation spent in the very village of which Sir John Horsynge was pastor. The village has not altered greatly from the time in which he lived and by a curious chance a Protestant meeting-house, Wesleyan I believe, stands upon the very spot in which the pre-Reformation rectory stood. When I was there the Anglican rector was trying to get possession of and close the chapel in the very spirit of six hundred years ago.

The two letters are in the possession of the Library of Lambeth Palace, and the account of the trial may be seen in a curious old work entitled " Vermifuge for Spiritual Stomachs or a Purge for Anabaptists, Jumping Jacks and Religious Mountebanks and all who oppose the religion established by the Authoritie of our Gracious Lord and Master Henry, eighth of that name and King of this Realme, whom God preserve from his enemies both in soule and bodie," and also in the roll of ecclesiastical trials for the Province of Canterbury now published, I believe, in the Rolls Series. The meager account of the life of John Horsynge is gathered from the Cambridge University Records and the archives of the dioceses of Winchester and Canterbury.

John Horsynge was born of a younger branch of the noble family of Cobham in or near the town of Havant in Hampshire, England, about the first of June, 1390. He appears to have been destined for the ecclesiastical state from a very early age, as in 1404 he appears as lay rector of the church of Minton Magna, and, through his guardian, suing for his tithes. He was entered at St. Peter's Hall in Cambridge the same year and apparently was a contumacious spirit even then as

he is described as *ferocissimus,* whether in mind or body is not stated. He received his Bachelor's Degree in 1407, and entered the Franciscan Order in 1408, not, however completing his novitiate, and reentering the university the next year. The Franciscan Novitiate was in Southampton, and the name of a "Frater Johannes Howsynnge" appears on the roll of aspirants. In June, 1407, there was a fight between the Franciscans and Dominicans in the town over a theological dispute, and immediately afterwards the names of three brothers are erased, among them John Howsynnge, the epithet *ferocissimus* presumably still applying. He procured M. A. the next year and took his B. D. in 1414, being then in deacons orders in the Diocese of Winchester. He next appears at the University of Paris, his expenses being defrayed by his uncle Sir Christopher Staignton of Snodland in Kent. He must have left Paris under a cloud as he was summoned to defend his orthodoxy before the bishop of Winchester before his admission to the priesthood. This was delayed three years during which time he seems to have acted as steward to his uncle at Snodland, finally becoming rector and being ordained priest in 1419. He must have been regarded as a person of some importance as the archibishop made a special journey to perform the ceremony in the Collegiate Church of Maidstone. In the roll of rectors he appears as *Sanctæ Theologiæ Doctor,* but where he obtained this distinction is a mystery as it was not conferred in England until thirty years later. In 1431 he was apprehended and taken to Maidstone on a charge of heresy, but remained in prison until tried at Canterbury in 1435. Apparently strong family influence was exerted, but he was finally condemned on a charge of treason and beheaded at Canterbury on January 2, 1436. The treason probably consisted of denying the king's religion and was a technical charge to save him from the penalty of death by fire, the orthodox punishment for heresy.

He appears to have written and forwarded a thesis to a

friend in Cambridge who handed it to the authorities. He was indicted on seven counts:

1. Affirming that infant baptism is unscriptural.
2. Denying that baptism is necessary to salvation.
3. Asserting that the pope had no jurisdiction in England.
4. That the king had no right to tax the church.
5. Denying the efficacy of the sacramental system.
6. Defying the archbishop's mandate.
7. Refusing to pay his taxes.

He seems to have carefully put himself in opposition to all authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, with the result that both king and Church combined to put an end to the firebrand.

He certainly left his mark in Kent. He does not appear in any English history and was not as well known as John Ball, also a Kentish priest, but Snodland and Maidstone were the very centers of the Reformation. The neighborhood has always been a point of opposition to the Established Church. Anabaptists, recusants, Puritans and in the antipapal days Jesuits and mass priests all found a refuge and protection from the ecclesiastical authorities among the sturdy and freedom-loving Kentish peasantry. The oldest Unitarian Church in England is situated in Maidstone, and no less than fifteen of the Snodland rectors appear as recusants and non-jurors, the losing side having apparently an irresistible attraction to both pastors and people.

The University of Cambridge being the home of the Franciscan School of Theology was always a center of pre-Reformation orthodoxy, Dominicans and Franciscans, Thomists and Scotians might and did engage in fierce theological battles, not infrequently ending in strife and bloodshed but, outwardly at any rate, and until, some centuries later, when Rome spoke authoritatively, both sides were rigid adherents of their respective schools and uncompromisingly loyal to the sacramental and hierarchical system of the Roman Church. A thrill of horror must have run through the theological circles of the

University when the thesis of John Horsynge was propounded for the consideration of the Divinity Schools. It struck at the very basis of the Christian religion as then understood in England. The thesis itself has unfortunately not come down to us, being solemnly burnt in front of St. Benet's Church by the Proctors of the University after the condemnation of the propounder. The heads, or at least four of them, appear in the proceedings of the ecclesiastical court:

1. That the sacrament of baptism is void without faith.
2. Unnecessary to Salvation.
3. That following from 1 and 2 it is unscriptural to baptize infants and demented persons.
4. Salvation depends only on the Sacrifice on Calvary and not upon the rite of baptism.

The thesis was never destined to reach the Debating School. Horrified by the blasphemy and, so he says, fearing lest a judgment should fall upon him by the very fact of having the document in his possession, the friend to whom it was entrusted, one Peter di Stillingflete, handed the fearful object to the Vicar General of the Bishop of Ely, who, there being no Inquisition in England, forwarded the matter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Stafford, who instituted proceedings as the criminals' diocesan. The most amazing part of the proceedings to twentieth-century eyes is the ferocity with which the prosecution was conducted and the absolute fairness of the proceedings. The trial was presided over by the archbishop in person, assisted by six assessors, two Dominicans, whose names are not preserved, two Canonists, Geoffrey of Shelforde and Dominus Gilfridus Wintonensis, who seems from his name to have been a layman or non-ordained cleric of Winchester, and a representative of the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

In view of the existing strained relations between king and Church it is remarkable that, in addition to the archbishop's mandate, a royal warrant was read convening the

court. It is possible that the crime of heresy was in England regarded as a civil as well as an ecclesiastical offense. Under the Act *De hæretico comburendo* passed in 1400 and the further repressive measures against heresy enacted in 1414, this may have been possible, although at the trial of Lord Cobham, a distinguished relative of our hero, the proceedings were purely ecclesiastical. It is also possible that the treason clauses were tried by the civil arm, the court being mixed, although as this would establish a precedent it seems improbable. Horsynge gloried in his heresy. He refused to plead, but generously offered to debate the points with any six doctors of divinity, the archbishop to referee! After wearing out the patience of his clerical judges, he was about to be condemned when he shifted his ground and claimed immunity on the ground that to condemn him infringed the right of any doctor to propound and defend theses in the open schools of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, and Edinburgh. The whole faculties of these Universities rallied to the defense of free discussion and to the everlasting glory of those seats of learning, vindicated their right as independent thinkers, and John Horsynge was acquitted. Rearrest and a retrial on the ground of his public utterances followed immediately, and he was condemned and executed on the technical charge of treason.

The following letters are interesting as showing that free speech and thought and even the suspicion of independent thinking were fraught with danger in those happy pre-Reformation times when certain recent writers tell us absolute liberty obtained in the Isle of Britain, and as evidence of the strides that Lollardism and probably Anabaptist doctrines were making in the county of Kent;

To Sir Christopher Staynton, Knight.

Right Worshipful Sir and my Special goodbrother. I recommend me to you and forasmuch as I cannot send you good tidings ye shall have such as I know.

It is so that Sir John Horsynge was taken from his house, into Maidstone and there indicted before His Grace for heresy, in that he wrote to Cantabrig [Cambridge] affirming Christening to be not of a necessity for Christian men but believing only and many other matters which I wot not of.

His Grace's inquisition is now at this house and enquires of all concerning our souls welfare and we be moidered [worried] as to whether we be accused or no.

I pray you to remember these matters lest you be interrogated also. The Bishop of Ely and other Bishops be at Maidstone. When I have more I shall send you more. I pray God send you all your desires.

Written at Snodland on Saint Edwards Eve [11th October] 1435.
By your sister Eleanour Cobham.

Amicabili magistro nostro, Christopher Steynton, Armigero.

Right Worshipful and tenderly beloved in the Lord. I commend myself to you Kinsman as one who wisheth you well in all things. Know that the inquisition of His Grace hath been at Snodland questing concerning the stand of your family and people towards the faith of Christ and His Church.

His Grace hath indued a parson to serve until Sir John (Horsuge) be hanged, which Jesus of His mercy send quickly. I beseech you therefore to so hold your family that they walk straitly in the ordinances of Holy Church lest worse things befall them.

It is reported that you have harboured singing priests [Lollards] to the scandal of many. God knows if this be true but I beseech you to walk warily.

May that high and mighty celestial Prince preserve you in soul and body and send the wisdom of the Holy Ghost to enable you to walk warily to his pleasaunce and to your worship, and send malison [curse] all your detractors. There be those who desire both Manors and they be both Lords and Holy Houses [Monasteries].

From your faithful priest and cousin
Christopher, Prior of Cobham

Cobham. The Wednesday next before the Annunciation. 1436.

The reason that John Horsynge does not appear in the roll of famous martyrs for freedom of speech and belief in medieval England is at first sight rather obscure. It must

be remembered, however, that he was technically condemned for treason and not for heresy and that his attitude toward baptism would estrange him from both Lollards and Catholics. Wickliffe remained a Catholic priest to the last and died a Catholic vicar. Neither he nor his followers would have recognized a denier of the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism. On the other hand, Lollardy was considered to be practically exterminated by 1431, and the authorities probably considered that publicity in the case of Horsynge might revive popular interest.

My own theory is that during his stay in Paris he came in contact with the disciples of that eminent heretic, Marsilius of Padua, who was rector of the University about fifty years before his time, but whose opinions were certainly promulgated throughout France until the latter part of the sixteenth century. As a Franciscan, Horsynge would have also come into contact with the work and views of William of Occam, an Englishman whose views to a certain extent coincided with Marsilius. It is further interesting to note the similarity of his views as expressed in his thesis to those of the Petrobrusians, who flourished in France some century or two before but continued to flourish until the Reformation. The great home of the Petrobrusians was the country around Toulouse. This University bestowed the degree of *Sanctæ Theologiæ Doctor,* and it was possibly here that he obtained his doctorate. We have a concise statement of the views of the Petrobrusians in the works of a Catholic author, one Peter the Venerable, who in his *Tractatus adversus Petrobrusianos Hæreticos* states definitely that they " denied that children before they came to the age of reason could be saved by baptism; or that another person's faith could save those who could not use their own." The other articles upon which he was tried are strongly reminiscent of " The Poor Men of Lyons," another sect with which he would have come in contact during his stay in France. None of these Continental forms of belief had been promul-

gated in England, and it is possible that the archbishop considered that the teaching of these new forms of religious conviction would be advertised by his death for heresy.

Whatever the legal quibble was under which he suffered, there can be no doubt that he was one of the unsung martyrs for liberty of thought and speech who paved the way for that individual freedom which is the glory of the English and American nations and our direct heritage as members of the Baptist denomination.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

The excavations conducted last spring in the vicinity of Kirkuk have been described in previous issues of the Quarterly and of the Bulletins. In this article I will simply deal with the special information we are beginning to gather from the large number of tablets which have been found in the palace and there brought to light.

These documents belong to a race which appears to have played an important rôle, culturally and politically, over Mesopotamia, Syria, and even Palestine. These people called themselves Hurri, and are of the same stock as the Mitanni, quite a strong power back in the days of Moses. In the Bible they are called Horites, and the term Hittites is more or less loosely employed both for them and for the Hittites proper. Racially, the Hurri are probably connected with the proto-Armenians, and they seem to have entered Mesopotamia from the region around the Caucasus.

Most of the data for determining the racial and linguistic affiliations of the Hurri have been gathered from a study of their personal names. But an additional help is furnished by their art. As is well known, the inhabitants of Mesopotamia used to sign their documents by impressing upon the wet clay of their tablets some small cylinders usually made of hard stone. These seals are generally made in the shape of little barrels, and are engraved with representations of scenes either of a religious character or referring to events of the daily life. From the impressions of these seals, very numerous in our tablets, we get a very clear idea of the art of the times.

Now we find that seals, absolutely identical with those of Kirkuk, have also been recovered from the ruins of all large cities that have thus far been excavated in Palestine and Syria and in levels dating from the oldest Semitic period. For want

of a better name, this art had been called Syro-Hittite. Even more interesting is the fact that the art of Cyprus employs the same decorations and the same motifs. More details will be given in an article which I will publish in collaboration with Dr. E. Speiser in the Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Let it suffice here to say that, from various indications, we are safe in affirming that the Hurri must have played an important cultural rôle in the ancient world, and at a period preceding the rise of the Assyrian Empire.

From the inscriptions on the tablets we can gather a very clear idea of the daily life among this practically unknown people. The records give us the complete history of one family, through four generations. They are what we call "legal and business documents." This general term embraces all matters worth recording, from a receipt for a small sum of money, to a marriage contract or the decision of a court of justice.

The founder of the family appears to have been a certain Puhishenni. We know little about him, except that he left to his children a very large estate, consisting mainly in fields, orchards, and houses. These were located both in his home town of Nuzi and in the surrounding cities. Most of our information centers about Tehib-tilla, one of his sons, and his direct descendants.

Tehib-tilla was apparently not satisfied with the large estate which had been left to him and proceeded to enlarge it to the best of his ability. We must give him credit for being a very good business man and for having kept his business strictly within the letter of the law, even though he certainly did not respect its spirit.

This is made very clear by the common practise of adopting children. There must have been a law in those times forbidding the sale of inherited land. Its aim was obviously that of protecting small properties against the cupidity of the big landowners. This law was circumvented in a very ingenious

way. Tehib-tilla does not buy lands from the peasants. He simply adopts them as his "sons" and their lands and houses pass over to him. He then compensates his children by means of a "gift," and permits them to remain in their lands to cultivate them for him. These so-called adoptions are very common, and Tehib-tilla must have had three or four hundred adopted children, not to count those adopted by his father.

The practical results of such a practise must have been even worse than those which the law intended to prevent. We find a system of peonage established throughout the land, which was gradually passing under the control of only a few landowners. A few independent farmers would struggle along, trying to preserve their independence, until the failure of crops or other adverse circumstances would force them to seek for an adoption.

In other parts of Mesopotamia, a farmer in distress could borrow money, or mortgage his field and house, hoping to pay off the debt when better times would come. But among the Hurri mortgages were rare and only contracted among rich parties, where adoption was out of the question. Loans with interest—in one instance this was sixty sheep for the loan of one hundred homers of barley—were also very rare. Adoption, which could never be rescinded, was the general rule.

It is easy to imagine that, under the circumstances, no love was lost between the father and his adopted children. In fact a large number of our tablets contain records of law-suits instituted by the "sons" or their heirs against their "fathers."

But these law-suits did not cause any great anxiety to our Tehib-tilla. He was fully prepared against just such an eventuality, and had kept in properly labeled jars and baskets the official records of all his adoptions. These had been redacted in the court of justice, which was situated at the gate of the city, and had been duly authenticated with the seals of the witnesses, or with those of the judges. In these docu-

ments the poor peasant had, knowingly or not, waived all rights of future legal actions in their own names and in the names of their children. Most of the law-suits are simply settled in favor of Tehib-tilla by the production in court of the original document. The oral assertions of the poor peasants had no weight whatsoever in face of this evidence.

And yet there were cases in which Tehib-tilla was either unwilling or unable to present the document in court. He simply opposed a flat denial of the charges made against him. The judges did not try to establish, through a rigorous investigation, which one of the two contestants was in the right. They had recourse to the easier method of the *ordeal.* We do not know exactly what was its exact nature, but we know very well that the peasants were afraid of " the place of the gods." Their refusal to submit to the ordeal proved them to be guilty, and they were generally fined and given as slaves to Tehib-tilla until they could pay their fine.

In other documents the rich landowners acted as prosecutors, and brought people into court for the most varied reasons. Farmers are accused of having caused the death of plow-oxen or stolen animals, or goods. Two men were brought into court for having eaten the colt of a mare, and one for damaging a chariot which had been left without horse by the gate of the city. All these cases end in fines, and consequent slavery.

The social condition of a woman of good birth was relatively high. We occasionally find women acting as witnesses in court, and possessing a seal of their own. The mother of Tehib-tilla engages in business on her own account and enlarges her estate by adopting as children quite a number of men. But, among the poor, women were as badly off as their men. They were gathered into harems and practically sold by their fathers into " daughtership and concubinage."

In one of the marriage contracts, the rich bridegroom was required to introduce his bride to all servants and slaves

as his wife. The clause was certainly inserted so as to guarantee to the wife, from the very start, a standing superior to that of servant or slave. How this worked out in actual practise we have no means of knowing. But, in any case, the woman had good reason to fear being treated as a slave.

We have some contracts of marriages of women to slaves. They contain the clause that, should the first husband die, the woman was to be married to a second, and then possibly to a third, or fourth; but that "from the house of Tehib-tilla she shall not go out." Strange as this may appear, this clause is for the protection of the woman so that she would not be thrown out of the house when old or sick. The contract also states that all children born of the marriage were to be treated as slaves. We pity the poor children because slaves had no protection whatever under the law. In a tablet registering the movements of flocks and their shepherds, we find three instances in which the shepherd has been killed by his master, and the incident is thus simply recorded: "Two shepherds belonging to Tarmia. One he killed and the other proceeded with the flocks to the city, so and so." Incidentally Tarmia, who figures in two of these three murders, does not appear to have lost by this any of his good standing in the community, for we find him sitting in the court as a regular judge.

And yet, though the condition of slaves must have been very unhappy, we find several men willingly accepting such a state and actually signing themselves and their wives into perpetual servitude. The strange thing is that these men are mainly Assyrians. Did they do it to escape a worse fate? In any case the fact proves that the power of Assyria at this time must have been rather weak.

The sons of Tehib-tilla continued to proceed in their father's footsteps and appear to have been even harsher than he in their dealings with the peasants. However, a just retribution appears to have visited his grandson. As I had occasion to mention, the places excavated offer clear proof of

having been systematically sacked and given to the flames. Their occupants were killed on the spot; and we have come upon the skeleton of a man sprawling in an unnatural position just outside of the house, and that of a woman and baby partly buried under the debris of the falling roof.

It would be tempting to imagine that the final destruction of the house of Tehib-tilla was the direct result of a vengeance on the part of his many oppressed "sons." And yet such an ending, though it would satisfy our sense of justice, still remains quite unlikely. In all probability both the "sons" and their "fathers" were swept away before the advance of some invading army. Who these invaders were, it is as yet impossible to establish.

EDWARD CHIERA.

QUAINT MISTRANSLATIONS

A FEW translations of the Scriptures have received nicknames from some single bizarre translation of a Hebrew word that had been misunderstood by the translators. Some of them have become quite familiar; as, for example, the "bugs Bible," so-called from Coverdale's quaint guess at the meaning of פקד rendered "terror" in Psalm 91 : 5, A. V. Since the one part of the verse referred to "arrow that flieth by day," it seemed clear to him that the other part indicated something that flies by night. What could this be but bugs? Hence, the rendering "Thou shalt not nede to be afrayed for any bugges by night."

Equally familiar is the famous "Breeches Bible," one edition of the Genevan version (1557-1560). Of what sort were the earliest invented garments? (Gen. 3 : 7.) The material was clear enough—fig leaves. The word חגרת is generally to be rendered "girdles"; but the translators of the Genevan version, being Puritans, may have unconsciously stretched their Hebrew consciences a little in the interest of their sense of what modesty would require, and rendered the word

by "breeches." "They sewed figge leaves together and made themselves breeches." Thus the men of Geneva put the first woman on sartorial equality with her husband. The more modern versions translate properly by the word "girdles." The King James translators seemed to have struck a compromise, and wrote "aprons"—which was well enough for the woman, but which no man likes to wear.

The Douay-Rheims version, the Roman Catholic English translation, preserve many quaint mistakes and absurdities of the Latin Vulgate of Jerome—which, on the whole was of course a noble piece of work. The English (Catholic) translators of this great achievement of Jerome were constrained to follow as closely as possible the Latin words, even when the Latin evidently meant nothing that was intelligible. Psalm 58 : 9 furnishes a good example of this sort of revered nonsense, in words: "Before your thorns did understand the old briar: as living so in wrath he swalloweth them." The Septuagint is similarly obscure, and the King James version is only a little better: "Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living and in his wrath." Moffatt probably disentangles the passage, at least from the maze of obscurity, by a dash of freedom from all the early texts: "Ere ever your pot feels the heat of the faggots, may he sweep them away in his fury"—that is, the wicked are to be swept away, as quickly as a pot feels the heat of crackling faggots.

Those who have visited the Church of San Pietro in Vinculi at Rome cannot forget Michael Angelo's great statue of Moses—greater, I think, than his David, or his Tombs of the Lorenzo Medici in Florence with their allegorical figures of Twilight and Dawn, Day and Night. From the massive forehead of Moses protrude two horns which are sufficiently conspicuous, even in the midst of the abundant locks of hair. This tradition of a horned Moses came out of an error in translation, committed first by Aquila in his Greek version, and fol-

lowed by Jerome in the Vulgate. The Hebrew קרן means, as a noun, "horn," but as a verb it is figuratively used for emitting rays of light, and so "to shine"; since rays of light easily suggested horns radiating from an object. So when the translator came to this word in Exodus 34 : 29, 30, 35, he rendered the passage "his face was horned," (κερατώδης ἦν). Jerome, having observed the uniform and literal faithfulness of Aquila to the Hebrew text, followed him here, with the words *cornuta erat*. Thus passed this blunder of Aquila and Jerome into medieval art. The figurative use of the word "horn," קרן, in the Old Testament literature is in itself an interesting word study. Beginning with the idea of "push," or "strike," the root (among a nomadic, cattle-loving people, as the Hebrews were in the early days) might easily suggest many metaphoric expressions, as well as outward resemblances to other objects in nature or in art. Not only were rays of light horns, but corners of the altars were horns of the altar; mountain peaks were horns, (cf. Horns of Hattin). Compare also German Swiss Matterhorn, etc. Tusks of ivory are called "tooth-horns" (Ezekiel 27 : 15).

Metaphorically, the horn stood for might, power, courage. To exalt the horn of God, was to praise his power. (1 Chron. 25: 5.) (Or perhaps we have here a more literal use of the word for the horn of an instrument of music, the trumpet for example.) The Psalmist calls God "the horn of my deliverance" (Psalm 18 : 2). Also God lifts up the horn of his people, reviving their power. (Ps. 89 : 24; 112 : 9; Amos 6 : 13.) God promises to make "David's horn to sprout"; that is, his power to flourish. (Psalm 132 : 17.) One readily recalls the song of Zachariah, when he praises God for raising up "a horn of salvation for us in the house of David his servant" (Luke 1 : 69). The beasts of Daniel and of Revelation with their numerous symbolic horns are readily recalled. Besides all these we have artificial horns. King Zedekiah "made for himself horns of iron," with which he was to push

the Syrians to their doom (1 Kings 22 : 11). Oil flasks were "horns of oil." Saul and Solomon were anointed with such flasks. (1 Sam. 16 : 13; 1 Kings 1 : 39.) Doubtless the Hebrew women used horns as containers for their perfumes and cosmetics. One of Job's daughters bore the name of Keren-happuk,[1] which means "paint horn," or in modern terms, "vanity case." Which would seem to indicate that although the status of women has greatly improved since the days of the patriarchs, their feminine foibles have been but slightly modified.

E. B. POLLARD.

[1] It is interesting to note that Moffatt gives the three daughters of Job their quite picturesque English names, Ringdove, Cassia, and *Apple scent*. It is quite evident why the first two should be so called, but the third name appears to be based on an amended text. Tappuach, "apple," and Happuk, "paint," might easily be confused in the Hebrew. But "applehorn" would seem a little far-fetched, as justifying the translation *apple scent*. Even an apple *blossom* scarcely resembles a horn, much less the apple perfume. The Septuagint renders the Hebrew name by the Greek words *Amalthias Keras*, or "horn of Amaltheia"—Amaltheia being the she-goat which suckled Zeus. From her horn was supposed to flow whatever its possessor might wish. Hence the term was equivalent to the Latin *cornu copiæ*, "horn of plenty." All of which indicates how free, how fertile, and sometimes how quaint, translators have been when they came upon strange words or combinations of words.

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

For some time a mechanistic theory of the universe has gripped the minds of a large number of scientists. This was not strange, since science deals with processes rather than with ultimate causes. But it looks as though science itself may shake the foundations upon which the theory of a mechanical universe rests. One of the most significant books in this field in recent times is A. N. Whitehead's "Science and the Modern World," which shows how unstable are the presuppositions upon which science has been building.

> The old foundations of scientific thought are becoming unintelligible. Time, space, matter, material, ether, electricity, mechanism, organism, configuration, structure, pattern, function, all require reinterpretation. What is the sense of talking about a mechanical explanation when you do not know what you mean by mechanics?

Many modern findings of science, like the discovery of radium, have entirely altered the view of the nature of matter itself. The very idea of mechanism is giving way to that of organism; and energetic organisms become the realities of science. There is no such thing as "dead matter."

Professor John Dewey, in commenting upon Professor Whitehead's book, says:

> The book is alive with suggestions regarding the bearing of the scientific change upon the deeper issues of society. I wish to point to simply one of these. He remarks that "biology has aped the manners of physics"; he might have added that with only the tools of the old science at command it was obliged to do so. At the present time, psychology is also aping the manners of physics, and with the consequence, as far as the influence of an influential school is concerned, of mechanizing education and social relations—in the precise sense in which Whitehead shows that mechanism has collapsed in physics itself. It is one of the tragedies of that professionalized specialism of science which Mr. White-

head reveals and criticizes, that the humane sciences are always adopting and using in the sphere of psychology, education and human relations, materials and methods which the more advanced physical sciences are abandoning. If the psychological school which claims to be the only genuine "behaviorism" could read and digest the physical ideas which this book sets forth an immense amount of misleading and confusing intellectual activity would be saved the next generation. Psychology emancipated to deal with the behavior of organisms as genuine organisms would be a very different thing in itself and in its educational and social bearings from a behaviorism which adopts uncritically the basic abstractions which have collapsed in their own region. It would cease taking the behavior of fragments of an organism as if they were the whole of behavior. Without such an abandonment, it will carry into human activity and education, with the pretended prestige of science, ideas which are depressing and enfeebling to what is most valuable in human beings, and which most requires some type of scientific control.

PROFESSOR GEORGE A. COE, in reporting for the *Journal of Religious Education,* February number, the now rather famous Students' Conference held at Evanston, Illinois, gives as the first three most decided convictions on the part of the delegates, these:

(1) The utter futility of denominationalism. It seemed to me that this conviction was practically unanimous, and that it was brought to the Conference, not worked up there. (2) A similar remark applies to the general attitude toward war and peace. The delegates voted against all military training in high school and college; they could not be induced to soften the resolution to "compulsory" training. On the other hand, there was no approximation to unanimity concerning one's own duty in case of war. Opportunity to be counted having been given, 181 declared it to be their purpose never to participate in any war; 65 said that, having considered the pacifist position they rejected it; 218 had not made up their minds. Perhaps the most significant aspect of these figures is that only one delegate in seven has rejected the pacifist view of duty and privilege. (3) The necessity of putting the church upon a completely non-dogmatic basis. The blunt resolution was opposed both in the interest of dogma and because some debater judged that the resolution ignored the necessity of thought for truly voluntary action; but the mass had its mind made up.

Some of the parents and elders have been horrified at the radical and uncompromising stand their sons and daughters are taking with regard to such subjects as these. But after all, the result has come through the training the elder generation has given these youths. The fathers ceased laying stress upon denominational differences and therefore no longer taught the distinctive doctrines which the several denominations once held dear, even though they themselves retained affection for their respective sects. The children come on the scene, and not having received the instruction and not having yet acquired the affection, throw the whole matter overboard.

With reference to war and peace. The fathers have taught the folly of war and the ideal of peace, but hold to the older idea and habit of patriotism—" My country right or wrong." Their sons, imbued with the ideals of peace, proceed to take those ideals seriously and consistently, and declare that peace is possible and must come, even if sometimes they may have to withstand their government's policies.

As to a non-dogmatic religion, which the youngsters are crying for—this too is the result of the attitude of the elders, They have in fact not shown that they cared much about creeds and dogmas, by way of zealously teaching them to their children. Their zeal appears only when they think some one is assailing their honored formulas, and then they are aroused to resentment. Hence the shock when the youth of the day belittles the value of dogma.

In other words, it is idle for the older generation to criticise the younger generation. The latter are what their elders have made them, either by positive instruction or by the lack of it. This applies to moral conduct, to religious instruction, and to the relation of youth to the church. The so-called " revolt of youth " then, is in part the crop from the elder generation's sowing.

But there is another element in it, which may well be

considered, and which may give some degree of reassurance. If youth were not in some real sense rebellious the world would become static and stagnant. The Creator has benignly put into the breast of youth the spirit of daring, of pioneering, of courageous experimentation—lest the fathers' good customs should corrupt the world. The revolt of youth is a rainbow of promise, a pledge of progress. To be sure it needs much guidance and sympathetic help lest it overleap itself and bring disaster. But it is not all bad, by any means.

In summing up the Conference of Students, at Evanston, Professor Coe has this significant comment:

> With respect to whether eyes are kept steadily upon the kingdom of God as a goal, perceiving where the main problems lie, diligence in assembling pertinent facts, willingness to hear all sides, comprehensiveness of outlook, precision of expression, ability to stand for individual conviction, and the kind of faith that rushes at the hard problems as if these were the characteristic sphere of live religion—if we make this comparison carefully and without prejudice, we shall find nothing that need put these youths to shame.

Doctor George Byron Gordon, in *The Atlantic Monthly* for February last, published a popular article setting forth some late discoveries with pick and shovel in the region of Mesopotamia, under the caption, "Abraham's 'Home Town.'" The book of Genesis begins Abraham's career in "Ur of the Chaldees," but as he made his departure from that city when he was still a young man, apparently under the leadership and direction of Terah, his father (Gen. 11 : 31), it is not at all probable that the most minute and earnest search on the part of the joint expedition of the Pennsylvania University and British Museums will discover anything relating to the great patriarch. It is true that some native Arabs, assisting in the exploration, and with the luxuriant imagination of the Oriental, have identified Abraham's dwelling, his foot-print on a brick, and even the foot-print of a dog, which most certainly belonged to Abraham! But scholars are satisfied at unearth-

ing much that is of fresh interest in understanding better the life of that ancient city and the civilization it represented.

It has long been known that the people of that region built high massive towers, or ziggurats, which had both religious and military meaning—the most familiar to the average reader is that of the Tower of Babel, mentioned in Genesis 11. These towers are regarded by many as evidence that the people who built them on the plains, came from the mountain regions, possibly of Arabia, where the high, protective citadels and the high-places of prayer were furnished by nature in the existence of the mountains themselves. When, however, the landscape itself did not so provide, it was necessary to construct them of brick. The interesting suggestion is also advanced that all subsequent temple towers, campaniles, and church spires are lineal descendants of the ancient ziggurats—peaks of worship in the plains. Thus we may have the genealogy of modern church architecture traced back by suggestion at least from St. John the Divine, New York, St. Paul's, London, Campanile of Florence—to Alexandria, to Borsippa, to the Tower of Babel. Thus persistent are religious forms, even when their initial meaning has long since disappeared.

This may bring us back to Professor Gordon's article, from which we quote the following interesting sentences concerning the ziggurat of Ur, in the neighborhood of which Abraham may have walked daily:

> The Ziggurat of Ur, that formless rock in the sea of sand, presents, after excavation, a fairly regular outline and is indeed an imposing monument, the most imposing in all of Mesopotamia, though the upper stages are in ruin. It rises foursquare on its broad platform and on an immense scale, in massive buttressed tiers of brick laid in bitumen. A hundred feet above the level plain its upper stage once supported a sacred shrine lifted into the heavens that now know it no more. The receding stages, connected by stairways, though solid and serving no other purpose than to attain elevation, still lend to the lofty structure very much the effect that we associate with certain very modern methods in

building-construction in great cities. The very name of ziggurat as rendered by scholars is the equivalent of skyscraper. In every ancient city of Mesopotamia the ziggurat was the principal feature, a towering landmark flinging its shadow across the flatness of the land. The most celebrated and the highest was the Tower of Babel, which was nothing else than the Ziggurat of Babylon, the loftiest structure known to its builders. It was three hundred feet high.

Of the Tower of Babel not a brick remains, but the scheme and method of the builders as described in the Book of Genesis are found to be reproduced in the older Ziggurat of Ur.

It is very common to hear the remark, "You cannot change human nature." Usually the utterance proceeds either from a philosophical pessimist, who is theorizing, or a practical schemer who has some selfish reason for desiring human nature to remain as it is, or else from one lazy and superficial, who has no willingness to exert himself to bring about a better human nature. As a matter of fact, human nature has changed and will change—the cruelties and barbarities of the World War notwithstanding. Representatives of the older orthodoxy should certainly have no difficulty in believing that the nature of man can be renewed by the power of God by a new birth. The evolutionist also should have no trouble in believing that human nature changes; for without such change there can be no evolution in the realm of spirit, or of morals.

Tennyson, with his rare insight, foreshadowing much that modern science has taught, sets forth among the sculptures in King Arthur's hall,

> In the lowest, beasts are slaying men,
> And in the second, men are slaying beasts,
> And in the third are warriors, perfect men,
> And in the fourth are men with growing wings.

It may well be that in the earliest times men found it hard to cope with beasts in strength and prowess. But by growing intelligence they were able to subdue and have dominion over the animal world. What of the third line, "men are

warriors, perfect men"? No, men are warriors, *killing men.* Indeed, it is a fact that man is the only animal that systematically kills its own kind, as men do in war. This is the grossest evidence of his imperfection. And the fourth? Are men just now in the process of "growing wings"? In truth, the angelic comes all too slowly. And if we may judge from the traditions of the elders, angels themselves have had their quarrels and their battles in the heavenlies. However, man, with all his brutality, and his inhumanity toward his fellows, has made progress in moral discernment; and the ethical level as a whole was never so high as today. Advance has not been uniform, nor have gains been made along all fronts, but there is a net result of progress, when all the facts along all the fronts are considered. Severe periodic strains upon human nature may sometimes appear to belie this view, but there is evidence of gain, when it requires even more severe strains, to bring about the collapse of moral habits and the beclouding of moral ideals, than once were necessary to produce such a catastrophe. Benjamin Kidd, in his "Science of Power," has clearly indicated, how, even in a single generation, through the use of education and "the emotion of the ideal," radical changes may be effected in human conduct.

The Journal of Social Hygiene for January has the following hopeful piece of information that is encouraging to those who have feared for the influence of motion pictures upon the morals of the youth, and strengthening to such reformers as believe that there is yet hope for a higher order of entertainment and instruction by means of the screen:

> A poll of managers of motion-picture theaters throughout the country was taken in order to learn what pictures during 1925 were the biggest money-makers. The results will go far toward allaying the fears of those who believe that, to "give the public what it wants," the magnates of the film industry must emphasize sex in its most unpleasant, unworthy, and unethical aspects.

The picture which attracted more money to the coffers than any other was *The Ten Commandments,* and with it, among the first five in point of financial returns, were *The Covered Wagon* and *The Thundering Herd.* Harold Lloyd comedies also rated high, three of them being named among the top twenty-five on the list. Other outstanding winners in point of financial returns were *Don Q, The Sea Hawk, Charley's Aunt, The Hunchback of Notre Dame,* and *Peter Pan.* The authors who figured most prominently were Zane Grey, the late Emerson Hough, Sabatini, Barrie, and others of standing in the literary field. Most encouraging of all was the fact that few if any of the pictures voted as the 100 most profitable were of the type which have been characterized as "sex stuff," and have brought forth so much just criticism from educators, parent-teacher organizations, members of the clergy, and others interested in public welfare.

The poll would seem to indicate that the great "movie"-loving public has been maligned by the exploiters of cheap and tawdry films, and that, in so far as it is possible to generalize, what "the public" really wants are the adventurous "Westerns" of Grey and Hough, the swashbuckling of Sabatini, the charming and whimsical imagery of Barrie, the clean-cut comedies of Lloyd, and their like.

If, in addition to these, we include the graphic news reels which some companies are producing, the wonderful travel epics, and the excellent science and nature-study films which are being more frequently programmed, it would seem that there are many causes for optimism in the cinema field.

As particularly notable achievements in the helpful educational use of the motion picture camera, one need mention only two of the recent films—the pictured story of the Beebe expedition on the "Arcturus," and the inspiring portrayal of Amundsen's aerial exploration in polar regions. In the sagas of heroic search this latter deserves to rank with the valiant efforts of the immortal Scott and his companions on their South Pole expedition. Those who have read Barrie's little address, *Courage,* will appreciate the measure of praise here intended.

The modern Baptist movement is but one of the many historic protests against radical departures from the fundamentals of New Testament teaching. About the middle of the seventeenth century a conjunction of influences gave rise and rapid growth to an independent body of immersionists in England, from whom, directly or indirectly, the great Baptist

denomination of today has developed. In America, where independence and democracy are atmospheric, Baptists have had their most rapid and most substantial growth.

Just now all American Baptists are in what appears on the surface to be an unhappy ferment. Canadian Baptists have not been in a state of serenity, the schools and their faculties being much in the foreground of debate. Southern Baptists have had some incarnate Discord throw the apple of evolution into their usually harmonious fellowship, and up to this time Paris has not been able to bring peace to rival contenders for the faith. In the North section, the most recent shift of agitation is toward a re-emphasis upon immersion and a stand against what has come to be called the "open" or the "inclusive church."

For this reason the QUARTERLY has given in the last two issues (January and April), large space to two articles from two of the leading professors in two of our theological seminaries, upon subjects, historical and critical, that may furnish background for intelligent appraisal of the various questions involved in the discussion. These articles, by Professors Anderson and Moehlman respectively, will be reprinted as pamphlets, and may be had on application to the CROZER QUARTERLY, for actual cost of the reprint at ten cents per copy.

IN a recent volume by several eminent thinkers, "Science, Religion and Reality" (elsewhere reviewed in this issue of the QUARTERLY) Dean Inge, in a conclusion to the series of essays, asserts concerning the present discussions on science and religion:

> Some recent writers have said that there can be no conflict between religion and science because they never meet. They move on different planes. To this way of thinking belong all bisections of the field of experience as those which oppose sharply to each other fact and value, reality and appearance, the knowable and the unknowable, the visible and the invisible, prose and poetry. To acknowledge such distinctions and rest an agreement upon them, assigning all on the one side

of the line to science, and all on the other side to religion, is at best a proposal for an armistice; it can lead to no permanent peace. A religion which does not touch science, and a science which does not touch religion, are mutilated and barren. Not that religion can ever be a science, or science a religion; but we may hope for a truce when the science of a religious man will be scientific, and the religion of a scientific will be religious.

Since the universe is one, and the mind of man is one, and since both are parts of one great realm of purpose, science and religion cannot be kept in closed compartments. Both deal too with facts of experience. And yet, is there not a real sense in which their spheres are different and their terms incommensurable? Science deals with facts and their relations, religion with meanings. Science deals with facts, religion with values; science deals with processes, religion with causes. Science deals with phenomena, religion with reality. Science deals with entities, religion with personality.

But the acute-minded Dean, sometimes "gloomy" in his outlook, expresses himself thus hopefully of the situation:

> If I had any doubts that the religion of Christ can, and will weather the storm, if I had any doubts that it is entirely independent of any false opinions about the nature of the universe, my readers may be certain that I should not have spoken as I have done. If I believed that Christianity stands or falls with a Ptolemaic universe, I should be obliged either to take the painful course of confessing that I have believed and taught all my life a creed which is as outworn as Paganism, or I should do like thousands of others—hold my tongue. But I am quite confident that this crisis will be surmounted if the church has the faith and the courage, and above all the common honesty to face it candidly. Only let us hear no more clergymen thanking God that theology and science are now reconciled, for unhappily it is not true.

Dean Inge thinks current theology is still dominated by the pre-Copernican science, and that the church must take one of three positions. It must insist that the scientist be allowed to say nothing the theologian does not approve; or must take the position that his traditional doctrines belong to a realm

above the natural order, and hence science cannot reach them; or thirdly, that all the theological doctrines which have been constructed "upon the geocentric theory of the universe be recast, inasmuch as the results of science, within their own sphere, are unassailable." The last course he thinks must come, and that it is far better than "trying to conceal an open sore which destroys our joy and peace in believing."

The Dean is quite right in holding that peace between science and religion cannot come, either by some formal *modus vivendi,* or by setting up a wall between two separate fields of experience. Sniping across the barrier may still go on, or ugly faces may still be made at one another across the fence. There is but one field. But when the scientist and the religionist both recognize that their respective instruments of discovery being different, neither should dogmatize concerning the findings of the other; that each has its contribution to make to the total knowledge of the universe and man; that they are fellow workers for the truth, then the age-long warfare will cease. The field is one field—all things—for both scientist and religionist. Their instruments and methods, hence their findings, are different, though not contradictory. It requires the findings of both to see the world, and see it whole. We need to have religion interpreted scientifically, and we need to have nature interpreted religiously.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

Reverend Professor Conrad H. Moehlman, who furnishes a comprehensive survey of the Baptist movement in history, is a native of New England, educated at the University of Michigan, and of Rochester, and is Professor of Church History in Rochester Theological Seminary. The discussion he presents is timely for the Baptists of the North, for it gives the historic background by which present-day movements can be discerned in clearer light. The article will appear also in the *Rochester Seminary Record.*

Our January issue carried the first part of the article of Professor Frederick L. Anderson, of Newton Theological Institution on "The Great Commission." It is completed in this number. The article of Professor Moehlman, above mentioned, deals with the question of the Great Commission, in one part of the discussion; and it will be noted, the two learned professors differ in their conclusions concerning this great passage in Matthew's Gospel. The reader may weigh the arguments on both sides. Neither writer saw the work of the other before the preparation of their respective articles. These papers will be put in pamphlet form, reprinted from The Crozer Quarterly.

Rev. William Coleman Bitting, D. D., Crozer '80, has held prominent pastorates, South, North, and West, having somewhat recently resigned the pastorate of the Second Baptist Church of St. Louis for a wider, freer service. Since its organization he has been the efficient Corresponding Secretary of the Northern Baptist Convention. His volume, "The Teaching Pastor," which was the Crozer Lecture Course for 1923, has been widely read. Doctor Bitting in the article published in this number has touched upon a subject which

should give all pastors who are concerned about their educated young people most serious thought.

Dr. Owen Philips Eaches, Bucknell '63, Theological Department '65, spent a large part of his useful life as pastor at Hightstown, N. J. His wide reading and scholarly tastes have given him an enviable place among his brethren in the ministry. He has for more than thirty years been a trustee of Crozer Seminary. His appreciation of the life and service of David Brainerd furnishes a wholesome antidote for the tendency to evaluate Christian service in terms of hustling achievement in the glare of publicity.

The Reverend H. F. Huse writes on the need of the word "involution," or at least of its more common use, as expressive of an idea made necessary by the much used, and much abused, word "evolution." Mr. Huse is a graduate of Newton Theological Institution, and is at present located at Dover-Foxcroft, Maine.

Doctor W. W. Keen is already known to Quarterly readers. His achievements as a scientist, surgeon, churchman, and lover of his fellow men have given him high rank in his generation. As he moves with steady step toward the ninety mark, like former President Eliot, he is the wonder and admiration of his younger fellow workers. As will be seen in his brief article in this issue, no movement or trend of the day escapes his alert eye.

Doctor John Crosby has had exceptional opportunity to investigate out-of-the-way nooks of church history. He gives our readers a most interesting account of an almost forgotten martyr, who dared stand against the ruling powers of his day, for some principles much honored by Baptists. Doctor Crosby has contributed to our pages before.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Key to Faith. M. O. Gershenson. Authorized translation, by Herman Frank. The Macmillan Company. 1925.

"The Key to Faith" is full of telling quotations and is constantly suggestive. It contains meat for the orthodox and the liberal, the pious and the scoffers, although —and perhaps because—it is an open departure from the beaten tracks which they severally follow.

So, in part, reads the advertisement on the jacket of the book, and such indeed is the content of the volume.

The author is a Russian Jew, who died in February, 1925. As might be expected he was familiar with the Scriptures of his people. Indeed he seems to have caught much of his fire and vision from his ancient kinsmen. He would be their modern interpreter. But he has also a philosophic interest in life. His primary interest is to understand the Absolute Good and synthesize life's experiences. This combination, the Biblical student with his intense enthusiasm for morals, and the philosopher who endeavors to reduce the great forces of the universe that play upon life to a unit—this lends the chief interest to the book.

The first chapter is entitled "The Burning Bush." The experience of Moses is the point of departure for the author. Here and elsewhere he treats "fire" as the Heraclitean symbol of the principle of all existence, the essential symbol of Deity. A vast array of texts from the Old Testament, in which God is compared to fire, is accumulated. Gershenson insists that not one of these is used in a metaphorical sense, but all are employed in their usual sense, and thus concludes that "God is essentially fire by nature, and his existence is a flaming existence that never burns out." In part he reminds us of Philo of old, who brought his Alexandrian philosophy to the Scriptures and made Moses and the Prophets speak the thoughts of Neo-Platonism. If the method of interpretation is not always convincing, his suggestions are always interesting, and his conclusions are worthy of pondering.

In following chapters, he outlines the Old Testament story of Jehovah's struggles with man and the covenant made between God and man. This is most graphic. God and man were naturally bound together by ties of mutual profit. The will of God is expressed to man through the cosmos. When man followed his own will as against the will of Deity, then God expressed himself through the cosmic forces of plague, famine,

fire, and sword. Thus man suffered when he refused to adjust himself to the higher will. Hence man was always bargaining with God, and God through cosmic forces was always paying him as he deserved. Through this struggle grew up the concept of a covenant and an elect people. It was based in the law of retaliation, "Obey me and prosper, disobey and suffer." This interpretation of history ran from the time of Ezra back to the time of Abraham.

Thus he believes that from the earliest days the religious leaders of Israel conceived that the true life of the nation or the individual must be in perfect correspondence with the laws of the universe. The outside world is constantly saying, "If you want to have health, peace, success, obey my rules, live in accordance with my will." In the great Prophets, however, there emerges another factor in the question. The problems that belong to the larger social group became influential in their thinking. Through the pressure of social contacts, righteous acts were conceived to be of supreme interest to Deity. Thus a new emphasis was heard. If the essence of religion was obedience to a higher power, now it was recognized that this higher power was interested in morals. Hence progress was made from the physical world to the moral. The law was not only that of the outer world, it was also that of the inner. Further, as over both the outer and the inner, the cosmic and the personal, there was but one God,

> by moral conduct man fulfills his cosmic destiny, for the cosmos really requires him to be good. God is one and the universe is one, and man is in deepest fellowship with God and with the Universe. The moral personality is the cosmic element in man, and beneath the marvelous diversity found in the universe is the natural unity, which is God. Man has to remember for his own benefit that his home is his castle by the will and the disposition of the true Overmaster, and that other unseen hands build his house together with him, that his every mite carries with it the will of the Master.

It is a suggestive treatment of a very vexed question. It is devoutly religious.

I. G. Matthews.

The Use of the Old Testament in the Light of Modern Knowledge. John Edgar McFadyen. George H. Doran. New York.

In this volume we have a series of studies in the Old Testament, which were previously published in *The Homiletic Review*, together with an introductory article that was published in *The Congregationalist*. They have in mind the Sunday-school teacher and the average laymen in our churches. Five different groups of material are dealt with; tales of the

early world; tales involving miracle; tales of Judges and Kings; Psalms, Proverbs, and Job; and finally the Prophets.

They are brief studies covering this very wide and diverse field. They face frankly the difficulties that the ordinary, alert reader finds today in such stories. There is full recognition of all the critical conclusions of modern scholarship. The Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature, and Theology of the United Free Church College, Glasgow, could never do otherwise. But the value of the book lies in the moral and religious lessons that are found on every page. Professor McFadyen is a scholar, but he is far more. He is a preacher, whether we meet him in his study, in his classroom, or in the interpretative page. His primary interest is always the message, and he has rare gifts in bringing that to the attention of the reader. For those who are still fearful of the results of modern scholarship, this volume will be read with great satisfaction.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

The Aim of Jesus Christ. A Critical Inquiry for the General Reader. WILLIAM FORBES COOLEY, PH. D., Instructor in Philosophy in Columbia University; Author of "Principles of Science," etc. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 227.

DOCTOR COOLEY has done a real service in the production of this little study. Though the ethical interest is dominant, he has been at pains to lay a solid historical foundation. In a book singularly free from polemic, his one aversion is for those who seek to make Jesus voice their own views. His object is to discover the aim of Jesus Christ—what he sought to do, and how he hoped to do it. This established, he shows how this original aim has been modified, often almost reversed, usually quite ignored. Since the changes in emphases—one could wish he had not called them viewpoints—in Christianity are fully shown, the author might have called his book "The Theology of the New Testament." How glad one should be he did not! It may now perchance be read.

The problems of life as lived today are faced. The vast differences between our day and his are clearly seen. Can one who was "a true child of his people and his time"; who "actually expected a speedy coming of a divine Kingdom here on earth, a Kingdom centered in Jerusalem"; and who was "deeply convinced of his commission from God to prepare Israel for its coming," be a force in the world today? Doctor Cooley is convinced he can and in almost lyric style urges our return to his aim and our attempt to realize, even as his, the opening petition of the Lord's Prayer. The hope of the world lies alone in the "elect" who can share

Jesus' breadth of interest, his enthusiasm for humanity. The pity of Jesus is not enough; his stalwart purpose must be clearly seen.

To attempt to detail his argument or list his findings would be most gratuitous. To do so would probably misrepresent, would surely rob the reader of the freshness and the charm. Suffice to say the hand of the student of history as well as that of the philosopher is seen on every page. One will not agree with every statement; one can not fail to admire the candor and integrity. In fact, there is just enough with which to disagree to make it worth the reading.

The style is good. Short, crisp, pithy sentences abound. Often they are most striking. Of a certain type of person he remarks: "The millenniums from Genesis to the Apocalypse are fused into a kind of separate supernatural age in which time has ceased to be." Or again of those who are not willing to take the historical question seriously, "They are so interested in the *Christ* figure as it functions in modern religious life that they beg the question as to the Jesus figure of 30 A. D." Yet occasionally one consults the dictionary to discover the significance of kobolds or Janizary.

While every praise is to be accorded the subject matter of the book and the form in which it left the author's pen, there one's praises stop. The printing of the book is atrocious. More than half the pages are not properly aligned; slips in proof-reading occur, while in two cases footnotes are carelessly thrown above the lowest line of text. It is a pity that a book, in itself so worth while, should suffer such mishandling. However, it has fared little worse than many of its predecessors.

But clothes do not make a man nor slovenly printing spoil a book. The study itself deserves the highest praise. It is a brave constructive attempt to meet a real need. A most wholesome book!

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Science, Religion, and Reality. Edited by JOSEPH NEEDHAM. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 396.

THIS volume is a collection of essays contributed by men who have won recognized standing in the fields of inquiry in which they have specialized. The introduction was written by Arthur James, Earl of Balfour, and Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and the conclusion by William R. Inge, the famous Dean of St. Paul's, London. The names of the essayists are guarantee of the accuracy, thoroughness, originality, and critical insight manifested by their contributions. Almost certainly it will be years before a better collection of essays dealing with matters

discussed will be gathered. The closing sentences of Balfour's introduction may well introduce readers to the contents of the volume:

> A science which declares itself incompatible with religion, a religion which deems itself a substitute for science, may indulge in controversies as interminable as they are barren. But there is a better way; and the writers of the following essays, each by his own methods, each from his own point of view, have ably endeavored to pursue it.

Dr. Bronislaw Malinowski, Reader in Social Anthropology, University of London, contributes the essay on "Magic, Science, and Religion." The essayist has made first-hand study of the South Sea Islanders, and his conclusions have led Dean Inge to remark in the concluding essay:

> It is quite unnecessary to go to Australia or Central Africa to find the savage; he is our next-door neighbor. The mentality of the stone age exists on our platforms and in our pulpits. There is no superstition too absurd to find credence in modern England; fetishes and tabus dominate London drawing-rooms.

The Dean is quite right. There are fetishes and tabus in scientific laboratories also. Magic, science, and religion have so much in common in their origin, that qualities of each persist in advanced civilizations. It is a discriminating man that can distinguish them in himself and in others.

Dr. Charles Singer, Lecturer in the History of Medicine, University of London, writes informingly on "Historical Relations of Religion and Science." The essayist confines himself almost wholly to the time before Newton. He tells a sad story in the annals of human history, but happily it is a story mainly of the past.

Dr. Antonio Aliotta, Professor of Philosophy, University of Naples, supplements Doctor Singer's essay by a brilliant contribution on "Science and Religion in the Nineteenth Century." For a keen estimate of Professor Aliotta's essay, read Dean Inge's paragraphs in the concluding chapter.

Professor Arthur S. Eddington, Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, has succeeded in condensing a mass of information in his essay, "The Domain of Physical Science." It is a territory easily traversed under his skilful guidance.

The following essays are probably of more immediate interest, for they touch vital matters in present-day religious thought: "Mechanistic Biology and the Religious Consciousness," by Joseph Needham, Fellow of Caius College and Benn Levy Student in Biochemistry, University of Cambridge; "The Sphere of Religion," by John W. Oman, Principal of Westminster College, Cambridge, and Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion, University of Cambridge; "Religion and Psychology," by

William Brown, M. D., D. Sc., Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy, University of Oxford; and "Science, Christianity, and Modern Civilization," by Clement C. J. Webb, Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion, University of Oxford, are essays of extraordinary merit, both for their critical acumen and their constructive results.

However valuable the essays in themselves, they are illumined by the genius of Dean Inge in the concluding chapter. He does not simply give a summary of the essays, but he fills up gaps that needed filling, and evaluates with incisiveness the merits of several of the contributions.

The foregoing enumeration of the subjects treated and of the writers is sufficient indication of the worth of this volume. To secure it and to master it is the equivalent of taking an exacting year of graduate work.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Sharing in Creation. W. COSBY BELL, D. D. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 227.

THE author, Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in the Virginia Theological Seminary, was chosen to deliver the Bohlen Lectures, 1925, in Philadelphia. The lecturer proved himself worthy of the trust reposed in him. The title itself indicates his familiarity with the present trend of thought in constructive theology. It assumes that this is not a completed universe. Nebulæ are still condensing into suns; the earth is still changing its configuration; social institutions are even now resolving themselves into new and unexpected forms; new ideals are being fashioned by the creative activity of the Christian spirit. Since the world is incomplete and man has not yet reached his goal, no problems presented in contemporary experience can be solved on the level of present-day thinking. Intellect today cannot give final solutions, for the simple reason that life impels to action; and tomorrow's conduct will present a new problem for the next day to ponder.

The book contains chapters on "The Maker of Heaven and Earth," "Method of Creation," "The Purpose of Creation," "The Providence of God," "The Problem of Suffering," and a "Conclusion" that trenchantly portrays the practical issues of religion. The writer aims to stimulate high resolve and noble endeavor, and sounds a clarion call to the practical task of sharing with God in the task of creating a new heaven and a new earth wherein shall dwell righteousness.

If Christianity needs to make itself at home, as is often said, in the modern world, the modern world needs even more desperately to make itself at home in Christianity.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Religious Experience and the Scientific Method. HENRY NELSON WIEMAN. New York. The Macmillan Company. Pp. 387. Price, $2.25.

Do we know God just as we know any other objects—trees, houses, men—or is God known in a different way, by some other organ, or method of knowledge than that by which we know the rest of the world? Is religious experience the experience of an object external to one's self just as truly as is the experience of a tree or a stone? It is to such problems as these the author addresses himself. He answers, God can be known; he can be known as other facts are known; that this knowledge is not through some peculiar, mysterious faculty unexercised toward other objects of knowledge. Immediate experience never yields knowledge in any sphere; and to cling to the view that God is discovered by some immediate and essentially different method of knowledge is to put a knowledge of God entirely outside the range of scientific knowing, where it is immune from examination or testing. The author thinks this to be fatal to religion. Religious experience may be subjected to the scientific method; and while we have now no science of God, and conceivably, may never have—this does not mean we have no dependable knowledge of God.

The chapter on "Science the Corrective of Religion" is a suggestive one. Science may serve a valuable purpose in freeing Christianity from the dry-rot of sentimentalism, and from the accretions and the inertia of tradition. The mystic becomes a fanatic when he refuses to test his experiences by critical judgments. So, the worshiper needs the scientist, as the parent may profit from the genetic psychologist in a better understanding of the child; but as the parent may go much farther than the psychologist in real knowledge of the totality of child-life, so the worshiper goes far beyond the reach of science in the cognition of God.

But if science and religion were rightly adjusted to one another, the worshiper of God would profit as much by science as the loving parent can profit by the genetic psychologist.

Science also needs religion, as much as religion needs science, says the author. "Scientific method and religious experience are the most extreme expressions of a quality that runs all through life." The technique of science magnifies our efficiency, but tends to diminish our capacity to enjoy, so art and religion came in to correct the one-sided development furnished by science. Science may also help the moral life by bringing a maximum of efficiency to our old self, but it cannot give us a new self. Here religion functions. A scientific morality may aid in forming a good system of habits, but can never give freedom and vision, needed for the highest morality.

In the chapter on "Christianity and Psychology," Doctor Wieman considers particularly the contributions of William James and Edmund Freud as among the most striking forces at work today in this field. While admiring James' empiricism, the author rejects the suggestions of James concerning the possibility or adequacy of the subconscious to explain any important religious phenomenon. The view of Freudians that religious beliefs and experiences are hardly more than castle-building in the air, of the stuff that dreams are made of, is vigorously refuted.

On the whole the book is an able, thoughtful, helpful one. There will be those, however, who will not go the full length of the author's radical empiricism, but, even after reading his book, will hold that there is immediate knowledge of God, and that what the Christian calls faith, is itself a method of knowledge.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Do Fundamentalists Play Fair? WILLIAM MENTZEL FORREST. New York. The Macmillan Company. Pp. 125.

THIS small volume is full of feeling. Its intensity is at once its strength and its weakness. Professor Forrest holds the chair of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Virginia. He makes ten charges of unfairness against the advocates of Fundamentalism. It is not fair for Fundamentalists to repudiate evolution as being contrary to Genesis and not repudiate also every other scientific theory that contravenes any statement or clear implication of Scripture. For example, geology that contradicts a six-day world; modern astronomy that is out of harmony with the Biblical description of the earth, sun, and firmament; philology which negatives the Babel explanation of diversity of tongues, etc. So, too, the writer thinks it unfair for the Fundamentalist to accept the Bible literally and reject Bishop Usher's Chronology, since the Bishop followed the Bible literally. So, the writer holds it to be unfair to blame any theory for all the wrong uses men have made of the theory. The Nietzsches and the Prussian militarists made use of Darwinism to advance their aim at world domination; so they used industry and invention and schools and churches. It is unfair to desert the real Bible which we possess, thinks the writer, to take refuge in the verbal infallibility of a Bible we do not possess and which few ever did possess, namely, the original documents.

These points will give the general trend of the treatise. The inconsistencies of the extreme Fundamentalists are clearly shown. The Book is at times too warm to be judicial. The term "Fundamentalist," like the term "Modernist," is too vague for any one to use unqualifiedly. And at times the writer goes out of his way to drag in irrelevant material, as when

he more than once hits at prohibition of the liquor traffic, as if on a par with anti-evolution laws; or when he blames the Baptists of Virginia for the proposal of a law to force the Bible into the public schools, whereas as a matter of fact but for the Baptists' protest the law would certainly have passed. One advocating fairness should take special pains himself to be scrupulously fair.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Nationalism and Religion in America, 1774-1789. EDWARD FRANK HUMPHREY, PH. D. Boston. Chipman Law Publishing Company. 1924. Pp. 536.

THE fifteen years from 1774 to 1789 were important years in the history of the American nation. During this time the Declaration of Independence was issued, a great war was victoriously fought, a "critical period" was endured, and our present constitution was adopted. Many historians have studied this period from the economic, political, and social angles, but they have usually minimized the influence of religious forces. Professor Humphrey in this work contends that religion played a large part in the creation of American nationalism. After a careful reading of this book one is convinced that he has proved his thesis.

The author divides the book into three logical divisions. Under the first heading, "The Religious Elements of the American Revolution," a summary is presented of the contributions of each religious denomination to the success of the Revolutionary War. The clergy of the Anglican church were loyal to their mother country, yet the same denomination produced the outstanding American leaders. The Congregational ministers "gave to the cause of the colonies all that they could give of the sanction of religion." No one can question the loyalty of the Presbyterians and the Baptists. The Roman Catholics can point with pride to the services of the Carroll family while the Mühlenberg family represents the Lutheran Church. The Methodists and the Quakers, however, did not play a patriotic rôle.

Under the second topic, "Nationalization of the American Churches," Professor Humphrey shows that with the nationalization of political forces at the close of the Revolutionary War came the nationalization of our religious groups. In 1784 the Methodist Episcopal Church of America was organized. In 1785 the Anglicans severed relations with England and formed the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. British jurisdiction over the Roman Catholics ended in 1785 by the appointment of an American, John Carroll, as the Superior of the Mission.

In Part Three, "The State and Religion," it is shown that during this period important steps were taken toward the separation of Church

and State in America. In 1786 Jefferson's Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia was passed. The fathers of the Constitution represented practically all the religious denominations. They wrote into the Constitution Article vii, section 3, which declared that no religious tests should ever be required as qualifications for any office or public trust in the United States.

Although the relation of nationalism and religion in America from 1774 to 1789 is the chief point of the book, yet it is in reality a remarkable compendium of facts in regard to one phase of American church history. The author has condensed in this volume materials which otherwise must be sought from the various histories of the different denominations. Many religious statistics are quoted. Valuable documents are inserted in the text. A bibliography of over three hundred titles is a valuable asset to the book.

Today, when history is becoming more than a recitation of political events, it is a pleasure to read this excellent work. It is a valuable contribution to the study of American church history. The teacher of American history can here secure interesting material for his lectures. The minister will find it helpful for his sermons. After reading this book the layman will have a greater appreciation of the contribution of the American churches to the development of our nation. More books of this nature should be written. The influence of religion upon American history should not be overlooked in the study of the more prominent economic and political factors.

PAUL N. GARBER.

A History of the Pharaohs. Vol. I, The First Eleven Dynasties. ARTHUR WEIGALL, late Inspector General of Antiquities, Egyptian Government, and Member of the Catalogue Staff of the Cairo Museum. New York. E. P. Dutton and Company.

VOLUME I is to be followed by three others. It contains 328 pages, is printed on the best of book paper, has twenty-eight illustrations, a copious index, and is well bound. It is built for durability and service.

The author was described by the late Mr. Roosevelt as a man "gifted with that supreme quality of seeing the living body through the dry bones, and then making others see it also." As the reader proceeds he is convinced that Mr. Roosevelt was right. The author's modesty, indomitable patience, and manifest passion for accuracy at once engage the attention, command confidence, and deepen interest as the reader proceeds.

The first task of the author to which these pages lead us is that

of reconstructing the almost interminable tangle of the ancient Egyptian Annals. That labor was immense. Data had to be gathered from the various museums in different parts of the world, from discoveries and computations made by former Egyptologists, and from vast quantities of broken and mutilated tablets barely decipherable. These had to be read, reread, the readings compared, checked up and amended that all confusion as to dates might be eliminated and a workable chronology secured. The first chapter shows how laborious this task was and how well it was completed. All unnecessary technicalities are eliminated. The writer keeps in mind the taste and ability of the average reader and at the same time is mindful of the requirements of the highest scholarship and that his is a service for the thinkers and investigators of the generations to come.

After working his way through the Annals, King-Lists, Chronologies and Calendars of Chapter 1, the reader enters the second chapter through one of the most pleasing descriptions of the valley of the Nile that has possibly ever been written. It is here that we begin the study of that period of more than 2,000 years which preceded the founding of the first dynasty under Menes, 3407 B. C. We read here of the Hornet-Kings, the Reed-Kings, the Hawk-Kings, of the Set-People, the People of On, of the origins of the ancient Egyptian civilization, of their arts, their social life, and their religion. If the early civilization of the Egyptians came from Babylonia, the author says, " It must be remembered that Egypt soon made it a far finer thing than Babylonia could ever have dreamed of."

Besides reconstructing the Annals and unfolding Egypt's ancient history there are many interesting and illuminating side-lights. The great pyramid was not built by lash-driven slaves under the galling tyranny of a brutal tyrant. It was constructed by willing toilers, otherwise idle while their lands lay submerged by the inundation of the Nile, who found in their task an opportunity and timed their toil to song and laughter. The great pyramid was born of the spirit of patriotism, it was a proud and thoughtful monarch's way of furnishing employment for thousands who had periods of enforced idleness. Its purpose was to secure an enduring fame for a brilliant civilization, a proud and noble people and their honored ruler. With this interpretation those " forty centuries " glow with a new beauty.

At the close of the volume we approach the dawn of the history of the Hebrews. Abraham left Ur, his native city, in 2123 B. C. Sarah, whom he had recently married, was about fifteen. A few years later famine forces them into Egypt. There they remain until the fall of the Eleventh Dynasty. The author closes by saying:

It is a matter of great satisfaction that the Egyptian Chronology which I hope I have established in the present volume has served to confirm the narrative of the Hebrew Patriarchs as related in the Bible, and that it has given a satisfactory date to the events in those sacred Scriptures which have been read and reread by our fathers and will be read by our children for the generations to come.

All who read Volume I will gladly welcome the others promised.

W. C. TAYLOR.

Ruth Talks It Over. JUNIUS VINCENT. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 130. $1.50.

RUTH is an undergraduate collegian. She talks with Junius Vincent, a teacher of psychology in a well-known American school, who has used a pseudonym for obvious reasons. The conversation deals with the inter-associations of young men and women of this generation of students. More particular attention is leveled upon the female sex, the behavior, attitudes, and language engendered in them by the "new freedom." The most delicate subjects are brought to the light in genuine frankness, and from the point of view of social idealism these matters are defended by Ruth and critically questioned by Junius Vincent.

If the findings of this conference are authentic (and on what substantial basis can the idealist refute them?), the author has issued adults a hard challenge to faith in youth. The most unconventional things are happening in the typical college girl's life. Thrill and adventure are in the saddle. So-called Freudian emotions, hitherto suppressed, must be explored in order to give positive expression to the maiden's becoming personality. Youth are all but shock-proof. What portends for marriage, home, parenthood, the state, none knows. Ruth is unalarmed. Is her prophetic judgment sound? The author expresses grave concern for the future of culture. Is this the decision of an age outrun? The reader may decide. At any rate it behooves friends of youth to know such facts as this monograph presents and be exercised in regard to them. First and last they must maintain the comradeship and good-will toward the "new era girl" which Junius Vincent has so splendidly portrayed.

STEWART G. COLE.

The Religion of Undergraduates. CYRIL HARRIS. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. Pp. ix, 87. $1.25.

The college mind is a strange conundrum. Especially in matters of religion. One may speculate upon the subject; one may try to tap the deep sentiments of youth reticent to talk; one may estimate the religion of

collegians by careful scrutiny of their life controls; or, one may depend upon the written rationalizations which they offer in response to critical inquiry. The author of "*The Religion of Undergraduates*" has doubtless drawn on all these sources of information, though he consciously chooses the latter method. As a pastor at Cornell University, he has gathered invaluable experience for his brochure. He asked several hundred college men and women to cooperate in his quest by writing down their interpretation of religion for his benefit. From these resources the thesis is forged.

Strictly speaking, the manual is not a presentation of the religion of college youth. Here and there one catches piecemeal pictures of such religion—should one say irreligion, religions, or religion? The subjective ideals of the writer are interwoven throughout the context. It is *he* who portrays campus religion, and what it might be, if taken more seriously. The contribution which the students make is their interpretation of some phases of religion, rather than personal confession of life values. The two may or may not be parallel. Rather unlikely in the sophomoric thinking of undergraduates. The result is when youths write they air their attitudes on certain orthodox religious topics without cutting to the quick of vital life endeavor. They require to have their postulates of religion redefined in the light of changing social emphasis. To find fault with the church (pp. 68, 69), with the ministry of the church (p. 5), with the Sunday school (p. 4), with traditional cosmology (p. 7), to engage in introspective analysis of personal feelings and failings (pp. 10, 46, 47), is to sidestep the major issues of modern religion. Philosophy, credulous or critical, is no necessary criterion of a person's religion. Though the author confesses this, it would seem his technique has not saved him from this pitfall.

The primary value of the text lies in the mature sympathy of the writer and his ripe suggestions in reference to improving college life. One illustration must suffice. Mention is made of the importance of a confessional for students. In such a confidential friendship they can "exteriorize" their conflicts and thus clear their imaginations and resolve repressed complexes of character. The author adds:

> The confessor must know men and women. His instinct for character must be so keen that in each case he can silently anticipate to himself the gist of what is coming. He must see the particular conflict involved and get all the facts out into the open, and apply the treatment proper to that person's need and that particular moment in his life. Incidentally, he should be able to detect whether this self-facing has been left too long, and what the effects are of the neglect. And finally, he must gauge the moral intensity and capacity of each individual, lest when

penance is imposed the penitent find himself up against such high demands as would be intolerable and impossible. All this is no easy task. No man may dare to say he is sufficient for it. The only conceivable reason for undertaking it is that it must be done (pp. 54, 55).

STEWART G. COLE.

Surveying Your Community. A Handbook of Method for the Rural Church. EDMUND DES. BRUNNER. New York. George H. Doran. 1925. Pp. v, 109. $1.25.

THE Institute of Social and Religious Research is placing at the disposal of churchmen a most valuable set of survey materials. The survey method is the first method of this day. Leaders have lived in the past by the assumption that, because they had spent many years in a community, they were consequently competent authorities of the life of the people. This may or may not be so. It depends on the nature of the acquaintance. Length of residence and frequent meeting with people do not insure sound knowledge of them. Such is based only on thorough social diagnosis. Nothing short of critical acquaintance with the human forces at work in a community, the creative personalities, the desires and interests that motivate them, family group and neighborhood mores, the historic and economic background of men and movements, will give a man prophetic insight into the life of a parish (pp. 29-30). And such knowledge is prerequisite to purposive kingdom building.

Today rural churches are suffering most from superficial administration. Denominational executives are alarmed at the rapidly declining status of these open-country institutions. The way of survey is the only initial method to adopt to meet the need. Survey of rural church leadership as of rural parishes. "Surveying Your Community" will help introduce a man to his people, his problems, his tasks. It is for the rural pathfinder rather than for the exhaustive diagnostician (p. 34). The work lends itself to four subjects: preparation of survey workers, collecting social data, correlating the same for study, and putting the information at the disposal of the church.

Any group of progressive people can use this guide to self-study. Written in plain speech, logically organized, clarified at every stage by chart and questionnaire, meeting most of the queries raised by churchmen, the schedule is practically "fool-proof." The strength of the handbook lies in its general usability and practicability for the rank and file of rural men. For gathering statistics and the discovery of elemental forces in a parish, it is indispensable. To guarantee a people a remedial program lies beyond the pale of any survey guide. That will depend upon the creativity of the local leadership. This manual points the way forward.

Of course it would be unsafe for a man to think that he knew the Alpha and Omega of his community when he had mastered the materials this study offers. Personality forces are profoundly subtle, and cannot be sketched by numerical counts. The survey is not meant to be sufficiently comprehensive nor the technique incisive enough to penetrate the fastnesses of neighborhood life and thus get at the deepest psychological forces therein. That ambitious objective reaches beyond the ken of this method. The reviewer is disappointed that the author conceived of the field of religious education as limited to the schools of the church (pp. 56, 59, 69).

STEWART G. COLE.

The Religion of Yesterday and Tomorrow. KIRSOPP LAKE, Professor of Early Christian History in Harvard University. Boston. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. Pp. 183.

THIS would have been a much more satisfactory book if the author could have rid himself of his superiority complex. His patronizing, supercilious air, though perhaps natural in one who has been an Oxford don and is a Harvard professor, is often a little trying for readers not fortunate enough to be graduates of either of those famous institutions. If one can forget this and concentrate one's thought on what the author says, forgetting the way in which he says it, one may derive considerable benefit.

Catholicism is the religion of yesterday, because it postulated the infallibility of Scripture, instead of postulating that experience is true. It was unwilling to receive instruction, to acknowledge as true that which conforms to fact and reason. Protestantism, so far as it postulates the same "truths," belongs to yesterday also.

> The Bible has enormous value for education, religion and literature, which no other book can replace, but it gives the story of Discovery, not of Revelation, in any sense in which the word has been or can be properly used, for Discovery and Revelation are not the same thing (p. 47).

But Protestantism, the intelligent and progressive part of it at least, has ceased to hold the old view of Biblical infallibility, and this great intellectual revolution has not only led to a collapse of the old theology, but had made the old denominational standards meaningless.

The real divisions of our day run across denominational lines, not along them. Professor Lake finds three well-defined parties now striving for supremacy: the Fundamentalist, the Institutionalist, the Experimentalist. The Fundamentalist he defines with sufficient accuracy; to the Institutionalist he is somewhat less than just; and to the Experimental-

ist he is perhaps as much more than just—his is of course the religion of tomorrow. In all this he says little that is new, but most of what he says is judicious.

Two chapters, entitled respectively "God and Prayer" and "Jesus," seem to set forth more clearly than other parts of the book the writer's own conceptions of religion. He regards as untenable, and also as unhistoric, the claims that Jesus could be either the Messiah or the Incarnate Logos. Neither of these was the original conception of the character of Jesus, he believes the literature to prove. But his arguments rest on this suppressed premise: The earliest ideas about Jesus were necessarily the best, and authoritative for all times. Is he quite sure that thesis can be maintained, about Jesus or any other historic character? Would he seriously try to maintain it in the case of any other than Jesus?

Professor Lake is uncertain whether all of the ethical teaching of Jesus is valid. He more than doubts whether the teaching of Jesus about wealth and the forgiveness of enemies is practicable now. He appears to misunderstand what Jesus meant by loving one's enemy: to will oneself resolutely into an attitude of friendliness, to show good will in speech and act to those who have injured us. It is frightfully hard, no doubt, it involves the most tremendous struggle that any man ever undertakes, but it is entirely practicable. And it is precisely because millions of Christians will not take Jesus seriously, and the few who do take him seriously reply "impossible," that Christianity is making so little real progress in the world.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

British Preachers, 1925. Edited by SIR JAMES MARCHANT. London and New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Best Sermons, 1925. Edited by JOSEPH FORT NEWTON. New York. Harcourt, Brace and Company.

The American Pulpit. Edited by C. C. MORRISON. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925.

IN these three cullings of good sermons from distinguished living preachers, we have at least an intimation that sermons are still being read. With three possible means of communication, the living voice, the printed page, and the radio, the preacher of today should not complain of opportunity for a hearing. Of course, it is only the exceptional minister who expects to make much use of any of these methods of dissemination, except the first.

"British Preachers 1925" is a collection of twenty-one discourses, each prefaced by a brief sketch of the preacher. Most of the names are

well known in America. L. P. Jacks, Reginald J. Campbell, John A. Hutton, James Black, J. C. Carlile, W. R. Inge, Leyton Richards, Tydeman Chilvers, George H. Morrison, E. W. Barnes, F. W. Norwood, F. B. Meyer, R. C. Gillie, John Kelman, Maude Royden, Charles Brown, H. Hensley Henson, and others. The sermons are upon vital themes, in the main. They strike the note of sincerity and move upon a spiritual plane. A tone of personal experience runs through the sermon by the only woman represented in the volume, Miss Maude Royden. That of Dean Inge on "Warfare, Devilish and Divine" is timely; that of Doctor Kelman, "The Garden and the Cross," is poetic, impressionistic. Indeed, there seems to be a growing tendency to *poetize,* if not to allegorize sermon texts. It is not the allegorizing of Origen and his successors, but the discovery in a passage of merely physical import the suggestion of some spiritual fact. An example of this is in the sermon of Doctor Hutton on "The Reopening of the Wells." The wells from which Abraham and Isaac drew water, become, for the preacher, human souls which become clogged by neglect and other causes. But Doctor Hutton is by no means the first to lift those wells of Canaan out of the ground.

Doctor Newton selects for a second time a volume of twenty-one sermons by American preachers, with introduction by himself. This time the Jewish and the Catholic pulpit are represented; and a layman, Mr. Glenn Frank, has his say in "A Layman Looks at Religion." The only overlapping of personnel with the twenty-five preachers represented in Doctor Morrison's Volume is Bishop Frances J. McConnell, whose theme is "Giants and Grasshoppers." American preachers seem to give more attention to striking titles than their British contemporaries; for example, "Anchors of the Driven Soul," by Rev. Oswald W. S. McCall, "The Human Harvest," by M. Ashby Jones, "A Sermon in Stones," by Thomas D. King; "Life's Foolish Rivalries," by Edgar Dewitt Jones; "The Bombardments of God," by William L. Stidger; "How One Man Discovered God," by Frank D. Adams; "Morning Visions," by William J. Dawson. A good sermon from an unexpected passage is by Doctor Andrew Mutch, on "Baptized for the Dead." Two of the young ministers, in the early thirties, furnish sermons: Harold C. Phillips, on "The New Earth," and Miles H. Crumbine, on "The Things That Are Excellent." Among the others are Bishop Slattery, Peter Ainslie, Charles F. Aked, Albert Parker Fitch, and John A. MacCallum.

"The American Pulpit" is the outcome of the much heralded poll of twenty-five thousand Protestant Ministers, taken by *The Christian Century,* whereby twenty-five preachers of the United States were picked as the best from among the many. Probably a better list could not have

been selected even had the laity (who are more accustomed to hear preaching, and so should be better judges than are preachers) made the selection. It is doubtless true that most of the twenty-five thousand voters cast their ballots upon the reputation of the preachers, rather than their personal knowledge. Most preachers hear very little preaching. It were better if they could. Then they might be more considerate of their hearers. The names of the chosen twenty-five, having been widely published, need not be repeated here. Every sermon by these preachers has a real point—and they range from the extreme Fundamentalism of Mark Matthews, to the Modernist view-point of William P. Merrill and Henry Sloan Coffin. There is the same tendency, to which we have already alluded, to poetize, as seen in Hillis' "There Go the Ships," Rice's "There Is Nothing," Hough's "Shining Stars of Expectation," Fosdick's "The Open Doors," Shannon's "Walking in Galilee," Conwell's "Above the Snake Line," and Billy Sunday's "Food for a Hungry World" from "Give ye them to eat."

There are, however, topics that suggest in the titles themselves substantial spiritual fare. Such are Cadman's "Character and Work," Speers' "The Christ Who Lives in Men," Gordon's "Conscience," Morgan's "The Mind of Christ," Jefferson's "The New Commandment," etc. Brown's "The Sense of Hearing" is fresh and gripping. Gilkey's "Journeys Out and Home" is meditative, helpful. Truett's is warm and soulful. Indeed, there is not a poor sermon in the collection. We find ourselves, when all is said of present-day preaching, in agreement with Doctor Fort Newton's observation in the Introduction to "Best Sermons."

> The conditions of life in our age, especially in our cities, are a challenge to those who would interpret the things of the Spirit. Everything is so speeded up, so crowded, so smitten with the fever of haste, as to make meditation and worship almost lost arts. Flash-light glimpses and spot-light thinking make a kind of mind so jumpy and scrappy and scattered that a large part of the public lacks the mental concentration, if not the capacity, to follow sustained thought; and that state of fact creates a changed atmosphere for preaching. For one thing, it makes expository preaching, so fruitful in other days, well nigh impossible, in America at least. The reading of hundreds of sermons, in order to make their selection, did not reveal a single example of that type of preaching. Such preaching must of necessity assume some knowledge of the Bible, in respect to which most of our hearers are almost illiterate, and half proud of the fact, counting it a very gray sin, to be coddled, lest they be deemed too pious. Great and deep themes can hardly be dealt with when the demand is that everything be "brief, breezy, snappy, something doing every minute."

EDWARD B. POLLARD.